

United States. I offer for printing in the RECORD at this point the resolution to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hereby requests the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense (after appropriate consultation with other agencies) to jointly transmit to the Joint Committee by January 3, 1952, a definite and concrete report on maximizing the role which atomic energy can and should play in the defense of the United States, including estimates of the amounts of money required, the specific extent and type of new facilities estimated to be required, the priorities in materials and manpower involved, the probable impact upon other defense projects and the national economy as a whole, and the joint views of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense as to the precise program which should be carried out in the atomic energy field.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that after we dispose of the pending business, we shall take up House Joint Resolution 289, to terminate the state of war between the United States and Germany. The resolution has been discussed today.

We hope, Mr. President, that we are nearing the end of this session. If I have been asked once, I have been asked a thousand times whether we are going to get away on next Saturday. I am unable to answer that question at this time, but I do desire to give notice that if it does appear, after developments tomorrow, that there is a possibility that we can get away this week, it may be necessary for us to hold a night session, and I want Senators to be prepared on short notice to remain.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator that I am sure there will be no one on this side of the aisle who would object to night sessions on Thursday and Friday if it will help us to bring the session to a close on Saturday night. I agree that the Senator cannot give us any indication as to whether we can or cannot get away, until the conferees on the tax bill have reported.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the Appropriations Committee is going to mark up in the morning the supplemental appropriation bill, and that will lie over until the next day. I am hopeful that we can iron everything out better than we have anticipated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator another question. A number of new bills have come to the calendar. I heard that the Senator from Arizona planned to have a call of the calendar again on next Friday.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought we should call it on Friday or Saturday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the intention to start at the very beginning of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no reason for that. We will start where the last call ended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I see no objection to that, provided it is not too diffi-

cult to take up some bills prior to that point.

Mr. McFARLAND. If there are such bills, I hope that we may have notice in advance, because if Senators ask unanimous consent to take up certain bills and exceptions are made, we may get into long discussions, and our time will be valuable in the last hours of the session.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know it has been done once or twice before, and I think it was done by the Senator's predecessor, who gave notice that certain bills would be called up. In other words, if the Senator gave notice the day before, on Thursday, let us say, that on Friday he would call up certain bills—

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to that procedure, providing we can have assurance that the differences really have been ironed out, and not that some Senator wants to bring a bill up again hoping that by going through another calendar call the differences can be settled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For purposes of the RECORD, and for our information on this subject, the Senator plans, as I understand, to call up the resolution with reference to peace with Germany after consideration of the mutual-security appropriation bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; tomorrow, provided we have time to dispose of the mutual-security appropriation bill. I wanted to give notice so that we could consider the peace resolution, if possible. I do not know how long the appropriation bill will take.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is perfectly agreeable. Then the Senator hopes to bring up another appropriation bill. Has he any plans for any other special bills? How about the District of Columbia home-rule bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is still on our agenda.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Among the matters which the Senator mentioned and of which we are all aware is the appropriation bill with reference to mutual security. The Senator said we may have trouble in getting these things ironed out. I want to serve notice that that is one of the things that may offer some difficulty in the ironing process. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee who sweated the question out for weeks and weeks, I was very much disappointed in the action of the Appropriations Committee in taking its little hatchet and making a 5-percent cut. It has been intimated here today that we had better take what is offered, or we may get something worse. That will be the responsibility of those who want to tamper with the security of the United States. This question, as I understand, turns on the news that there has not been any tax bill passed. We will pass a tax bill before we go home. If we do not, when we get home, if I know the President of the United States, I think he will have us back here until we do pass one. That is what I would do if I were in his place, which I never will be. But Mr. Truman has called us back be-

fore, and certainly he has a precedent in his favor. But, above all, he has common sense.

There was a slogan in the Manufacturers' Association about a year ago to the effect that we should pay as we go. Now it seems to be, "You pay and I will go."

I wanted to offer this suggestion to the majority leader for the purpose of letting him know that there may be a few of us who will have something to say about the cut in the mutual security appropriation bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. It has always been my understanding that the ironing out process is hard work, and the ironing out in this case seems to be no exception to the rule.

Mr. McMAHON. I merely made the suggestion.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 18, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 17 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Abraham J. Harris, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Hon. Guy L. Fake, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harley A. Miller, of Puerto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico, vice Philip F. Herrick, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles Draper William Canham, O18496, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Frank Dorn, O15278, United States Army.

Col. Willard Koehler Liebel, O15723, United States Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. L. Longmire Speight, assistant pastor, St. Agnes Catholic Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, who through Jesus Christ hast revealed Thy glory to all nations preserve the work of real freedom which Thou hast brought forth in this land. Let the glory of its freedom shine before other nations as a freedom wrought by those who knew that all men are created free and equal before Thee.

Guide the deliberations of this House. Give to each of us a wisdom conceived in prayer that every work of ours may tend toward the preservation of peace.

Direct all our actions by Thy inspiration, and further them with Thy continual help, that every prayer and work of ours may always begin from Thee and through Thee be brought to an end. Grant our petitions in Christ's name. Amen.

The journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abbitt | Deane | Mack, Ill. |
| Allen, Calif. | Dempsey | Martin, Iowa |
| Allen, La. | D'Ewart | Miller, Calif. |
| Angell | Dingell | Morrison |
| Baker | Donovan | Morton |
| Barden | Dorn | Moulder |
| Baring | Engle | Murphy |
| Barrett | Fulton | Murray, Wis. |
| Bates, Ky. | Golden | Phillips |
| Beall | Gwinn | Powell |
| Bender | Hébert | Prouty |
| Blackney | Herlong | Redden |
| Blatnik | Hess | Regan |
| Boggs, La. | Hollifield | Ribicoff |
| Bosone | Howell | Richards |
| Bramblett | Irving | Rivers |
| Brooks | Jackson, Calif. | Roosevelt |
| Brown, Ohio | Javits | Sabath |
| Buckley | Johnson | Shelley |
| Burleson | Kearney | Sikes |
| Busbey | Kelley, Pa. | Thompson, Tex. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kennedy | Thornberry |
| Celler | Keogh | Vursell |
| Cole, N. Y. | Kilburn | Watts |
| Combs | King | Werdell |
| Coudert | Latham | Wilson, Tex. |
| Crawford | Lucas | Wood, Ga. |
| Dague | McDonough | |
| Dawson | McKinnon | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 343 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Commit-

tee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to take effect immediately.

Most respectfully,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Sincerely,

CHARLES P. NELSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Forty-second District, New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 464) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CHARLES P. NELSON, of Maine, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 465) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That FRED G. AANDAHL, of North Dakota, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 466) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1197)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4386) "making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 13 and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 10, 12 and 15, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That, during the current fiscal year, such appropriations shall not be transferred to or used to start or resume any project for which funds were not allocated for construction in the preceding fiscal year; but this proviso shall not apply to any project for which funds are provided in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 18 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535);"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$192,657,613"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$316,544,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$60,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 105. No part of the money appropriated by this act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Army from appropriations for civil functions during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 9.

CLARENCE GANNON,

JOHN H. KERR,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,

CARL HAYDEN,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

MILTON R. YOUNG,

GUY CORDON,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 1—Administrative expense limitation: Authorizes a limitation of \$1,525,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2—Administrative provision: Provides that appropriations in this bill cannot be used to start or resume any project for which funds were not allocated for construction in fiscal year 1951. This proviso does not apply to any project for which funds are provided in this bill.

Amendment No. 3—Administrative provision: Changes the name of the project known as Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C., to John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—Administrative provision: Provides for the payment of tuition fees

at civil technical institutions for not to exceed 18 student officers instead of 25 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Rivers and harbors: Appropriates \$192,657,613 instead of \$162,860,500 as proposed by the House and \$213,932,613 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Transfer of funds: Authorizes transfer of not to exceed \$1,725,000 to the Secretary of the Interior for fish and wildlife studies instead of \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,740,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Flood control: Appropriates \$316,544,100 instead of \$268,009,900 as proposed by the House and \$335,011,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Layton Reservoir, Tex.: Provides not to exceed \$300,000 for construction of water conservation and utilization facilities at the Layton Reservoir, Tex., as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10—Flood control, general (emergency fund): Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11—Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: Appropriates \$60,500,000 instead of \$59,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$61,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Miscellaneous civil works: Appropriates \$16,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Niagara power development: Deletes provision of the Senate providing \$1,000,000 for Niagara power development.

PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 14—Canal Zone government: Appropriates \$11,595,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$11,668,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 15: Deletes provision of the House limiting amount of funds in the bill to be used for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Revises provision of the Senate limiting amounts of funds in the bill for personnel engaged in informational activities to exclude the Panama Canal Company.

With respect to Amendments Nos. 5 and 7, the conferees are agreed that obligations and expenditure of funds provided therein shall be made in the following manner:

1. No funds are to be obligated or expended on the following projects:

a. Ice Harbor lock and dam, Washington;
b. Oologah Reservoir, Okla.;
c. Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.

2. For rivers and harbors, \$192,657,613, to be allocated in the following manner:

| Rivers and harbors | |
|---|--------------------|
| Project | Amount recommended |
| Alabama: | |
| Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ala., Fla., and Ga.: | |
| Buford Dam, Ga.: | \$900,000 |
| Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida: | 6,300,000 |
| Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala., and Miss.: Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama: | 4,000,000 |
| Alaska: Wrangell Narrows: | 247,000 |
| Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: | 4,100,000 |
| California: San Diego River and Mission Bay: | 510,000 |

| Rivers and harbors—Continued | |
|--|--------------------|
| Project | Amount recommended |
| Florida: | |
| Jacksonville Harbor: | \$1,787,000 |
| Jacksonville to Miami waterway: | 2,150,000 |
| Lake Worth Inlet (Palm Beach Harbor): | 238,843 |
| Georgia: Savannah Harbor: | 370,000 |
| Illinois: | |
| Illinois waterway (exclusive of Calumet-Sag Channel): | 300,000 |
| Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers: Chain of Rocks canal: | 5,000,000 |
| Mississippi River between Missouri and Minneapolis: | |
| (A) St. Anthony Falls, Minn.: | 1,500,000 |
| (B) Other work, including Clinton, Iowa: | 357,770 |
| Ohio River open-channel work: | 175,000 |
| Iowa: Missouri River from Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa: | 4,000,000 |
| Louisiana: | |
| Calcasieu River and Pass: | 1,025,000 |
| Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: | 4,400,000 |
| Pearl River, La. and Miss.: | 987,000 |
| Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels: | 800,000 |
| Massachusetts: Fall River Harbor: | 200,000 |
| Michigan: St. Marys River: | 750,000 |
| Mississippi: Harrison County shore protection: | 773,000 |
| Missouri: Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth: | 2,300,000 |
| Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck: | 944,000 |
| New Jersey: | |
| Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers: | 732,000 |
| New York and New Jersey channels: | 1,414,000 |
| New York: | |
| Buffalo Harbor: | 305,000 |
| Hudson River channel: | 250,000 |
| New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas: | 400,000 |
| Ohio: Cleveland Harbor: | 1,000,000 |
| Oregon: | |
| McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington: | 42,900,000 |
| The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington: | 4,000,000 |
| Pennsylvania: | |
| Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.: | |
| Locks 2, Pennsylvania and Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia: | 4,000,000 |
| Schuylkill River (culm removal): | 1,900,000 |
| Tennessee: | |
| Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: | |
| Cheatham lock and dam, Tennessee: | 3,000,000 |
| Old Hickory lock and dam, Tennessee: | 2,000,000 |
| Texas: | |
| Gulf waterway (Galveston district): | 800,000 |
| Houston ship channel: | 1,000,000 |
| Sabine-Neches waterway: | 465,000 |
| Virginia: Quinby Creek, Accomack County: | 20,000 |
| Washington: Chief Joseph Dam: | 16,892,000 |
| Planning: | 500,000 |
| Current expenses: | 66,965,000 |
| Total, Rivers and Harbors: | 192,657,613 |
| Of the above amount of \$66,965,000 for current expenses, not to exceed \$2,025,000 is included for examinations and surveys which includes \$300,000 for survey of northern and | |

northwestern lakes and \$1,725,000 for fish and wildlife studies.

3. For Flood Control, General, \$316,544,100, to be allocated in the following manner:

| Flood control, general | |
|---|--------------------|
| Project | Amount recommended |
| Arkansas: | |
| Blakely Mountain Reservoir..... | \$5,700,000 |
| Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo..... | 14,960,000 |
| Narrows Reservoir..... | 200,000 |
| Pine Bluff..... | 265,000 |
| California: | |
| Cherry Valley Reservoir..... | 3,400,000 |
| Farmington Reservoir..... | 214,000 |
| Folsom Reservoir..... | 6,870,000 |
| Isabella Reservoir..... | 4,500,000 |
| Los Angeles County drainage area (exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir)..... | 6,085,000 |
| Merced County stream group..... | 265,000 |
| Pine Flat Reservoir..... | 8,000,000 |
| San Antonio Reservoir..... | 1,000,000 |
| Whittier Narrows Reservoir..... | 4,500,000 |
| Colorado: Pueblo..... | 217,500 |
| Connecticut: Mansfield Hollow Reservoir..... | 3,000,000 |
| Florida: Central and southern Florida..... | 6,000,000 |
| Georgia: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C..... | 18,000,000 |
| Idaho: | |
| Albion Falls Reservoir..... | 10,000,000 |
| Lucky Peak Reservoir..... | 3,800,000 |
| Illinois: | |
| Columbia drainage and levee district..... | 400,000 |
| East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek drainage district..... | 500,000 |
| East St. Louis and vicinity..... | 1,500,000 |
| Farm Creek Reservoirs..... | 1,500,000 |
| Grand Tower drainage and levee district..... | 800,000 |
| Prairie duRocher and vicinity..... | 900,000 |
| Wood River drainage and levee district..... | 915,000 |
| Indiana: | |
| New Albany..... | 575,000 |
| Vincennes..... | 300,000 |
| Kansas: | |
| Hutchinson..... | 1,900,000 |
| Kansas City, Mo. and Kans. Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska, including Nebraska City..... | 2,312,000 |
| Wichita and Valley Center..... | 500,000 |
| Kentucky: | |
| Ashland..... | 2,000,000 |
| Covington..... | 1,400,000 |
| Hawesville..... | 108,000 |
| Louisville..... | 4,500,000 |
| Maysville..... | 1,000,000 |
| Wolf Creek Reservoir..... | 3,000,000 |
| Louisiana: | |
| Mermentau River..... | 707,000 |
| Natchitoches Parish..... | 360,000 |
| Maryland: Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va..... | 1,000,000 |
| Massachusetts: | |
| Adams..... | 225,000 |
| North Adams..... | 400,000 |
| Minnesota: | |
| Aitkin..... | 600,000 |
| Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn..... | 700,000 |
| Missouri: Perry County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3..... | 1,000,000 |
| Nebraska: | |
| Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr..... | 1,200,000 |
| Harlan County Reservoir..... | 1,000,000 |
| New Mexico: Jemez Canyon Reservoir..... | 900,000 |

XCVII—841

Flood control, general—Continued

| Project | Amount recommended |
|---|--------------------|
| New York: | |
| Hoosick Falls..... | \$206,000 |
| Mount Morris Reservoir..... | 5,000,000 |
| Olean..... | 392,000 |
| North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C..... | 17,000,000 |
| North Dakota: Garrison Reservoir..... | 37,083,700 |
| Ohio: Muskingum River Reservoirs..... | 472,000 |
| Oklahoma: | |
| Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla..... | 400,000 |
| Fort Gibson Reservoir..... | 2,400,000 |
| Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir..... | 3,500,000 |
| Oregon: | |
| Detroit Reservoir..... | 16,978,000 |
| Lookout Point Reservoir..... | 16,000,000 |
| Willamette River Basin (bank protection)..... | 400,000 |
| Pennsylvania: | |
| Conemaugh River Reservoir..... | 9,500,000 |
| East Branch Clarion River Reservoir..... | 2,000,000 |
| Williamsport..... | 775,000 |
| South Dakota: | |
| Fall River Basin..... | 400,000 |
| Fort Randall Reservoir..... | 34,699,000 |
| Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak..... | 3,770,000 |
| Tennessee: | |
| Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky..... | 500,000 |
| Memphis, Wolf Creek, and Nonconah Creek..... | 750,000 |
| Texas: | |
| Belton Reservoir..... | 4,000,000 |
| Benbrook Reservoir..... | 339,000 |
| Fort Worth floodway..... | 700,000 |
| Garza-Little Elm Reservoir..... | 3,000,000 |
| Lavon Reservoir..... | 1,500,000 |
| San Angelo Reservoir and floodway..... | 1,200,000 |
| Texarkana Reservoir..... | 4,000,000 |
| Whitney Reservoir..... | 3,800,000 |
| Virginia: Philpott Reservoir..... | 2,940,000 |
| Snagging and clearing..... | 800,000 |
| Emergency bank protection..... | 500,000 |
| Sec. 205 projects..... | 1,000,000 |
| Planning..... | 1,000,000 |
| Current expenses..... | 7,060,000 |
| Total, flood control, general..... | 316,544,100 |

¹ To be derived by transfer from funds allocated to Fort Randall Reservoir, S. D.

Of the above amount of \$7,060,000 for current expenses, not to exceed \$800,000 is included for preliminary examinations, surveys and contingencies, which includes \$400,000 for the comprehensive survey for New England, and \$400,000 for the comprehensive survey in the White, Arkansas, and Red River basins.

4. For planning: rivers and harbors, \$500,000; flood control, general, \$1,000,000.

The conferees are agreed that the unobligated balances presently available to the Corps of Engineers from previous appropriations shall be coupled with each of the above mentioned amounts with specific allocations to the following projects:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| a. Tuttle Creek Dam, Kansas..... | \$400,000 |
| b. Toronto Reservoir, Kansas..... | 100,000 |
| c. Strawn Reservoir, Kansas..... | 250,000 |

No planning shall be started on any new project, any unauthorized project, or continued on any old project (except Tuttle Creek Dam, Toronto Reservoir and Strawn Reservoir) unless certified by the President as necessary to the defense effort within the criteria set forth in the conference report on chapter IX of the general appropriation bill, 1951.

The conferees on the part of both the House and the Senate are in agreement as to the need for a comprehensive flood con-

trol program in the Missouri River basin and the urgency for prompt action thereon. They recommend, therefore, to the respective Committees on Public Works that immediate consideration be given to the establishment of a Missouri River Basin Survey Commission, members to be appointed by the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President, which shall be authorized to make a full and complete investigation and survey of flood conditions and proposed measures for control thereof in the lower Missouri River basin area and to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1952.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we submit represents a complete agreement between the House and Senate managers on every item in the bill.

One amendment is reported back for a separate vote, but it is merely in technical disagreement and is only brought back in conformity with the rules of the House.

Agreement does not mean that any member of the committee of conference approves the bill as written, but it does compose our disagreements as nearly as we could compose them.

And I do not suppose the bill as reported is fully acceptable to any Member of the House or Senate. But, again, it is as nearly acceptable as we could make it in view of all the conflicting opinions with which we had to deal.

Unable to reach agreement on the many requests submitted, the committee found it impracticable to consider the bill item by item and was reduced to the necessity of considering it by categories, eliminating all unauthorized items, all unbudgeted items and excluding or including other classifications which could be handled en bloc. If items are omitted, it is because that particular request fell within the prohibited classification or in some way failed to conform to categories included in the drafting of the bill.

Of course, Members understand the desire of the committee to include provisions favored by colleagues and our regret at not being able to include all. But I am certain they also understand the impossibility of providing for all proposed expenditures even in normal years, much less a year in which so large a part of the national income must be devoted to national defense and all expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control must be borrowed and increase to the full extent of the bill the deficit which must be added to the national debt.

To further complicate the situation there are certain "must" items in the bill to which the ordinary rules of economy cannot be applied. Among them are the appropriations for flood control in areas devastated by the record-breaking flood in the lower Missouri Valley where destruction and consequent paralysis of business have been so complete as to require exceptional measures. In response to this situation the conference report carries \$400,000 for the planning of the Tuttle Creek Dam, \$100,000 for the Toronto Dam, and earmarks \$250,000 for

the Strawn Dam. These items provide all the money customarily appropriated, according to the regular routine, until the definite project report is complete.

After the definite project report is formulated, the project is reexamined from an economic standpoint. Then, and not until then, if the benefit cost ratio exceeds unity, funds for construction are requested. These requirements have not yet been complied with. The Army engineers testified yesterday that the DPR for the Tuttle Dam has not been completed, and will not be completed, until some time next year. In the meantime negotiations for relocation of railroads, highways, and purchase of land can be taken up without waiting for the appropriation of construction money.

The wisdom and importance of following the regular schedule is apparent on a cursory examination of similar projects. For example, it was necessary to move the location of the Gavins Point Dam 8 miles after its first location. The Wappapello Dam on the St. Francis River completed in 1940 with the assurance that it would control the floods in the St. Francis Valley, saw the most destructive flood in 1945 ever seen in that valley. It has been said that if the dams contemplated had been built on the Kaw and its tributaries this flood would have been controlled. But when the official weather map showing the rainfall area where the flood originated was superimposed on the map showing all dams—existing, authorized, or proposed—it showed that if every one of these dams had been built and had been in operation at the time of the flood, not one of them would have lain between the area of heavy rainfall and Kansas City, and all of them combined would not have saved the city and the Missouri Valley below it from the disastrous flood which swept from the Kaw and on down to the Mississippi. The Oahe Dam cost 60 percent more than the advance planning indicated. Relocation cost 180 percent more and land acquisition, 165 percent more. On one project relocation cost 4,839 percent more than the estimate.

But cost is a minor consideration in comparison with the success of the system in controlling floodwaters after it is built and after it is too late to correct mistakes. The Board of Engineers, the Congress, or the country cannot afford to take chances on short cuts when so much is at stake.

All members of the committee and of the House are in complete agreement on the necessity of taking every step to prevent recurrence of floods in the lower Missouri and its tributaries, particularly in Kansas and Missouri. And all are convinced of the necessity of providing for control at the earliest date possible. But successful control of floodwaters in this area is too vital, involves the life and property of too many people, is of too permanent a character, and requires the expenditure of too vast a sum of money, to permit any departure from the established practice. The conference report provides every dollar asked by the Board of Engineers for planning. This bill will become a law about the first of

November. Congress will be back in January. When construction money is in order it will be provided.

How much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member of the committee desire?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the adoption of this conference report. At the proper time it is my intention to offer a motion to recommit this report to the committee of conference.

We passed the original civil-functions appropriation bill in June of this year at a time when we led the country to believe that we were sincerely interested in the curtailment of expenditures which could not be directly traced to the national defense effort. As a result of that attitude which prevailed in June, an attitude which seems to have been dissipated on the floor of this House in the last few weeks, that bill after a unanimous subcommittee report, was approved by the House with cuts totaling approximately 20 percent. That bill was passed with a total amount of about \$514,000,000.

What has happened to that effort in the weeks since June? The Senate upped that bill \$124,000,000. Some of this can be justified on the basis of a supplemental estimate of \$21,800,000, but only a little over half of that money is actually included in this bill. Those items were not before the House at the time that we took action on the original measure. So that if you discount that separate appropriation, while it is included in this over-all amount, for the time being, it means that the Senate added over \$100,000,000 to the bill which passed the House. They upped the appropriation just about 20 percent.

In the conference report before us this morning the total amount is \$597,000,000-plus. That is an increase of about \$83,000,000 over the amount which passed here. Practically every reduction in existing projects was lost before we actually conferred with the Members of the other body. They were lost by a concession the first day we went to meet with them. The conferees of the House said: "We will agree with you as to the amount that you put in on all of these existing projects," which included a number of projects that in our consideration in the House we considered to be new projects. This conference report abrogates the work of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, the work of a subcommittee which was unanimous and which was approved overwhelmingly here on the floor of the House.

This conference report includes many new projects. I cannot recall of any single major new project, many of which, practically all of which, were cut out in the House, that is left out of this conference report with the exception of Ice Harbor.

Some of the justification for the new projects is: Well, we have had this flood situation, we need more for flood control.

But I think it is a fair statement that the flood situation in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri has been used only as a psychological weapon in order to increase flood-control appropriations throughout the country.

Another excuse is: Well, we have to have this power, there is a shortage of power. But I submit to you you cannot justify construction for power in this time of emergency when you cannot get 1 kilowatt of power off the line until 1956 and you will not reach the maximum until 1958. That is not meeting the power needs of the present emergency.

It is one of the strange inconsistencies in this conference report that the only real cut in a power project was in that dam which would provide the cheapest and the best single source of power in the United States.

This is not the commitment of a few additional millions here today. This is a commitment of billions of dollars in the immediate years that lie ahead.

Sure, the camel sticks that pretty little nose under the tent. It does not look too bad, and even when the head gets in, it is kind of a friendly looking thing, but pretty soon the camel is in the tent and the tent comes down on top of you.

I want to ask this question: Was the unanimous report of our subcommittee worth anything when you approved our work and passed the bill without adding a single dollar? Were the Members of the House here sincere? Did they do that with the expectation that the other body would put it all back in and you would get it anyway? Or did you really mean it when you approved the work of the subcommittee?

Did you agree at that time that non-defense spending had to be cut? If you really believed in economy then—and I believe the Members of the House were sincere in that belief and in that act—have there been any favorable changes of circumstances that would cause you to change your mind now? Is the situation any better in Korea today than it was then that would make you think we were not in a defense emergency? Do we have more money available to spend on these projects now after the tax bill was defeated yesterday? Have we appropriated less money for the Military Establishment and less money for military construction and less money for foreign assistance than you thought we were going to appropriate when this bill was on the floor of the House? Is the over-all appropriation picture any better today than it was on the 13th of June?

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of economy talk, there are still a great many people in this country who approve the action of the Members of this body, who are for the appropriations and against the taxes, and in the present state of the people of this country that still seems to be the best method by which the Members of the House can be reelected. The House voted for economy on the 13th of June last, but those efforts have been lost; they were lost in the other body and they were lost in the conference committee. I

submit to you that the only real justification for some of the additions which have been made in this measure since it left the House here in June is that: "Well, we have just got to help out good old Mr. So-and-So."

Mr. Speaker, because of my belief that this House meant what it said on the 13th of June, and because I believe that the efforts which we made on this floor on that day have been substantially dissipated in the other body and in the conference committee, I intend to offer a motion to recommit this measure to the conference committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I saw that you refused even the planning funds for the Tennessee Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe there was a specific statement to that effect in the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. That would shorten the water distance between our atomic bomb plants and the Gulf of Mexico, one 800 miles and the other 300 miles, and cut the cost of transportation to the irreducible minimum. What excuse can the committee give for thus attempting to block something that has been approved by the great engineers of America and on which we have already spent \$600,000 in planning?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks his committee has been fair to the Members of the House who were advised not to appear before the committee on certain projects on the ground that no money would be appropriated for the beginning of new projects or completing projects already under way, unless they were connected with defense, and then you go over and meet in conference with the representatives of the other body and concede a lot of things? Do you think that is fair to the other Congressmen who did not try to impose their projects on your committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Let me say, first of all, to my colleague from West Virginia, that the decision with respect to planning money and unbudgeted items was not made until after the hearings had been completed, and I know that our subcommittee did spend a great deal of time listening to Members of the Congress who did appear before the subcommittee. But I also want to point out to him that when he asked me about conceding on these matters, that he will not find the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin as one of the signers of the conference report.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to commend the gentleman for the position he is taking. It seems to me that we all should support the gentleman's motion to recommit this report, due to the action

taken yesterday in turning down the tax bill. There will be less money to spend than some people thought they were going to have to spend, and certainly anyone who voted yesterday against the tax bill should support the gentleman's motion to recommit this report. We have to cut down these expenses. This is one place we have to do it, no matter how it hurts, and even if it hurts ourselves.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I hope a lot of the Members here on the floor will support the motion to recommit regardless of how they voted on the tax bill yesterday. I think there is a valid basis for that motion irrespective of the action yesterday.

Mr. KEATING. I did not mean to imply anything different.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That merely accentuates the fiscal problem we have.

Mr. KEATING. That is right.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. May I point out to the gentleman from New York who stated that because the tax bill failed yesterday the motion to recommit should prevail today that a large number of the Members who voted yesterday against the tax bill were not voting that way because the tax bill contained too much taxes but because not enough taxes were imposed. I think the gentleman will find that if he will scrutinize some of the votes cast yesterday.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe the gentleman from New York intended, in fact, I do not think he did say that that was the only basis for this motion to recommit.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I inquire if all the study and planning moneys in this bill are earmarked?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; that money is not earmarked. As to the planning money for flood control and rivers and harbors, the gentleman will notice there is \$500,000 for one and \$1,000,000 for the other. A part of the flood-control planning money is earmarked but the other is not. The gentleman will note in the conference report that there is a release from earmark of previously allocated funds of about \$800,000 in rivers and harbors and about \$3,500,000 in flood-control planning, which previously had been earmarked for other projects.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is there much money in this bill, if any, for national defense purposes?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. You can establish some sort of tenuous connection, I suppose, between almost any appropriation these days and the national defense effort. If you sit on any subcommittee on appropriations you will

certainly hear people every day trying to convince you of that.

Mr. MORANO. Is there any direct money for national defense in this measure that the gentleman knows of, something about which there would be no question in the gentleman's mind?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. As of this moment, I cannot mention any particular project.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am interested to know the exact meaning of the words "shall be coupled with" in paragraph 4 on page 8. Does that mean that the \$500,000 set aside for planning on rivers and harbors and about \$1,000,000 for flood control generally means that the \$750,000 for the three items in Kansas will come out of those amounts?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My recollection is that Tuttle Creek and Toronto planning money comes from the \$1,000,000 and, yes, the amount for the Strawn Reservoir of \$250,000 does come out of the \$1,000,000 that is mentioned there for flood control.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that those three items get three quarters of all the money for planning for flood-control works and that the Member who has a small project in his district will get nothing?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My recollection on Tuttle Creek and Toronto is not completely clear on that. Does the gentleman from Michigan recall that?

Mr. FORD. It is my recollection of the action taken in the conference that the money for Tuttle Creek, Toronto, and Strawn did come out of the \$1,000,000 for flood control. However, it should be brought out in addition that we unobligated almost \$3,500,000 of flood-control planning money, which goes into the pot, so to speak, for planning for projects that can be so certified.

Mr. DONDERO. That is flood control alone?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is for rivers and harbors outside the \$500,000, if any?

Mr. FORD. The unobligated balance which is being earmarked is \$872,926, which is in addition to the \$500,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to deprive my colleague from Michigan, or any other members of the subcommittee, who desire to speak, of the opportunity to do so. I think the question of the distribution of time should be cleared with them before I accept any additional time. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if the time has already been committed.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have at least 12 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, who was a member of the committee of conference, and one of the managers on the part of the other

body, intended to sign this report. It was our impression that he had signed it. But through some inadvertence his name is not included in the printed report. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HOLLAND be authorized to sign the conference report and that his name be included as one of the Senate managers in the report as printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes the request that the Member of the other body be permitted to sign the conference report. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri yields five additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, before I take the time, I would like to inquire whether I would be depriving other members of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from Michigan who wanted at least 12 minutes of time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] a member of the committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on this appropriation bill, I would first like to say that the problem we faced as House conferees was a most difficult one. It was a very difficult one. There was very little, if any, cooperation from the Senate conferees on the issue of economy.

The House, as you will recall, reduced the budget estimates \$126,000,000 from approximately \$640,000,000 to about \$514,000,000. Those are approximate figures. The Senate in its wisdom, or its lack of it, increased the overall figure substantially. The other body by increasing the House figure \$124,000,000, in effect wiped out practically all of the reductions that the House had previously made. I must say, however, in the interim between the action of the House and the action of the Senate on this legislation, the budget did send over an additional request of about \$21,000,000. But, the total increase by the Senate from the figures we dealt with in the House amounted to about \$100,000,000. As a result, this conference report in effect, sustains the action of the other body and not the action of the House. The figure in dollars is about \$83,000,000 or \$84,000,000 more than the figure that the House approved.

In my estimation, this conference report is faulty in two basic respects. One, there is too much money in it, particularly so far as the House bill is concerned, and second, the money that is appropriated, or may be appropriated, is badly distributed among projects. In my judgment, the allocations among projects are particularly bad. Some projects which are very deserving have been deprived of funds, and some projects, which I think are less deserving under the circumstances, are given too much. For those two reasons, one that the bill is too much, and second, that the distribution is bad, I am wholeheartedly supporting the motion to be offered by the

gentleman from Wisconsin, which will seek to recommit the conference report to the conference committee. In its present form the bill will be a distorted and overgrown monstrosity.

Any person who analyzes this conference report objectively will come to this one conclusion: that the conferees have taken care of a lot of individuals in and out of the Congress, a lot of special groups, and a limited number of geographical areas. Over-all there is little or no protection for the Nation's taxpayers. I think it is our responsibility, and duty regardless of our interest in particular projects, or regardless of our interest in particular geographical areas, to perform to the taxpayers as a whole. In this bill we avoid that duty and responsibility.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. When the gentleman finishes his statement I wish he would elaborate on section 4 on page 8. There is much confusion on that planning money for rivers and harbors and flood control.

Mr. FORD. I will try to explain that subsequently.

At the time the bill came before the House, the House subcommittee set forth a very definite formula as far as any project was concerned. First, we said that no new project should be considered. Second, we said that no new segment of any project should be considered. We also adopted a policy of making reductions on individual projects. This House sustained the subcommittee, and I think the House as a whole did exactly the right thing. If you fail to vote for a motion to recommit today, the House is in effect repudiating what the membership did on June 12 this year.

There are a number of new projects in the bill. There are a number of new segments which will be started. In fact, practically every new segment that was recommended by the budget is taken care of. In addition the conference committee authorized some unbudgeted projects. They have been thrown in, for what reason I know not. But I might say that in the estimation of some it was purely the old "pork barrel" with plenty of log-rolling.

At the time our subcommittee was holding long and extensive hearings, it became well known that our subcommittee was going to adopt a rather rigorous attitude concerning unbudgeted items. Some members, I think, using very good judgment, decided to not make appearance before the committee even though certain local projects were deserving. Others did appear. Our subcommittee turned down all new projects and particularly emphasized that non-budgeted items be excluded. When the bill went to the Senate I understand there was literally a flood of witnesses from the House in an effort to try to convince the Senate that certain projects which were unbudgeted should be included in the bill. The Senate, in its wisdom or lack of it, decided to include a limited number of unbudgeted items.

In my judgment, in good conscience, we cannot go along with the inclusion of unbudgeted items. I do not say that they are not deserving, but I do say they are no more deserving in any way than the unbudgeted projects that some of the Members of the Congress did not try to promote simply because they knew that they could not be justified under any circumstances on the basis of national defense. I pay tribute to those who used good judgment. I think this conference report should be turned down on that basis, if no other. You cannot under any circumstances justify these unbudgeted items, for they do not contribute directly to the national defense effort. They should be excluded from the bill under any circumstances and by supporting the motion to recommit these projects will be deleted.

It also should be called to the attention of the Members of this body that the House did recede on the question of the Jensen amendment. The Jensen amendment was approved on a roll call vote, but the House managers receded. I feel strongly that if this motion to recommit is approved we can make some progress in trying to effectuate proper distribution and proper reductions in the bill and in addition work out some compromise on the Jensen amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENSEN. I should like to know what reason the conferees gave who opposed the Jensen amendment, what reason they gave for deleting the Jensen amendment from this bill.

Mr. FORD. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the reason given for receding was that the Jensen amendment was not applicable from a practical point of view to the situations in this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Everyone who opposes the Jensen amendment has used that same excuse. The only way we can effectively reduce the personnel in agencies is by an amendment of this nature. Of course they howl; they howl, they cry, they say they cannot live under the provisions of the Jensen amendment. Anyone who has any sense at all and knows anything about the administration of this Government knows they can live under the Jensen amendment and should live under the Jensen amendment and reduce their forces in proportion to the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. FORD. In further answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I should like to say that under the conference report \$1,000,000 was given for flood-control planning, including the planning funds for Tuttle Creek Dam and Toronto Reservoir, and \$500,000 for river and harbor planning. Further we unearmarked \$872,926 river and harbor planning money. I should add that \$250,000 of the million total for flood-control planning was earmarked for Strawn Reservoir. On flood control we unobligated or unearned \$3,475,800.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman tell the House how much unobligated funds that will leave for river and harbor work and for flood-control planning?

Mr. FORD. I understand the grand total is \$5,848,726.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that there will be something over a million dollars for planning river and harbor work, and something like four and one-quarter million for planning the flood-control work.

Mr. FORD. As I understand, about \$4,400,000 for flood control.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Enlarging on what the gentleman from Michigan has been able to bring out in his questions, am I to understand that the action of the conferees results in covering the funds on those unobligated projects back into the Treasury or does it just unfreeze them so that they may be available for planning of other projects?

Mr. FORD. The money was unfrozen from those projects which had heretofore been earmarked, and the funds therefrom are now in a pool. The decision as to where the planning money should be spent is left to the Army engineers under the direction of the President subject to criteria set forth in conference report.

Mr. BAILEY. The money was not covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. FORD. The money was not covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In the next paragraph the language states that no planning shall be started on any project, and so forth, unless certified by the President. That means that all planning will be subject to confirmation by the Executive before any work can go ahead.

Mr. FORD. All planning for flood control will have to be certified by the President as being essential to the national defense.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I am interested in the statement the gentleman made that there are unbudgeted projects in this conference report. I appeared before the committee with the most meritorious project, a project that caused great damage to citizens of the United States through no fault of their own. I withdrew because the committee assured me and told me they would not consider any project that was not budgeted.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from North Carolina had a very meritorious project. He had a number of constituents who testified and gave a very appealing presentation. I must say to him his project was as worthy as any other unbudgeted project. But he withdrew, as he indicated, and the House did not allow his or any other unbudgeted items. I do not know whether he testified be-

fore the committee in the other body or not.

Mr. BONNER. I may say to the gentleman I did not, because I thought that was a firm statement.

Mr. FORD. It was firm as far as some of us are concerned. His project is equally as worthy as any of these unbudgeted projects which are included in the bill at the present time.

Mr. BONNER. I wish the gentleman would point out the projects that are not budgeted.

Mr. FORD. The unbudgeted projects included in rivers and harbors are, for example, Clinton, Iowa; Quinby Creek, Va.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say there were some \$4,000,000 available for planning. Will he be kind enough to give us the figures embraced in the total amounts that can be used for surveys in that \$4,000,000?

Mr. FORD. The \$4,000,000 does not include any survey money whatsoever.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. How much money is available for survey work?

Mr. FORD. Eight hundred thousand dollars is made available for survey work. The survey money is earmarked. It includes \$400,000 for a comprehensive survey for New England and \$400,000 for a comprehensive survey in the White River-Red River-Arkansas River Basins.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That means that we have \$400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to carry out surveys on projects authorized by the Public Works Committee to determine their economic feasibility, is that correct?

Mr. FORD. You would have nothing outside of those funds that are earmarked unless there are some unobligated balances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We are going to cease carrying out steady works in connection with flood control during the next fiscal year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What is the status of surveys on flood control where the surveys are nearly completed and very little work must be done? Is there any money in there for that purpose?

Mr. FORD. The Corps of Engineers may have some unobligated balances for such survey work. I cannot give the gentleman offhand what the amount is. Perhaps there may be some. I do not recall specifically.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is everything in this bill or in this conference report earmarked as far as surveys are concerned?

Mr. FORD. The survey money to be appropriated this year is all specifically earmarked.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There will be no funds in this legislation that will take care of uncompleted surveys in the country?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, whether he realizes it or not, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is rendering one of the greatest disservices to this country, and especially as to his own State of Missouri, and to every other State in the Middle West, and in the South, of any man who has served in Congress for the last 50 years, by waging his relentless fight to prevent the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

His attempts to usurp the functions of the Committee on Public Works by having a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations conduct its fake investigation of this project was one of the greatest blunders in the history of Congress.

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is the missing link in our national defense program, as well as the missing link in our internal waterway system.

It is the greatest project of its kind that has ever been proposed, and is the only one that can be constructed anywhere in the world that would transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances, while saving the swift current of a major stream, such as the Mississippi, for the downstream traffic.

The nearest approach to it is the connection between the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, which Stalin is now speeding up with all possible haste, probably using American lend-lease machinery, if not American lend-lease money, for that purpose. While the Don-Volga project will transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another, it will cost infinitely more money than will the construction of this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, and will not have the advantage of saving the swift current of a major stream such as the Mississippi for its downstream traffic.

Is it not ridiculous to be spending billions and billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money to build similar projects in foreign countries, some of them in enemy countries, and at the same time deny funds to speed up the construction of this missing link in the greatest inland waterway system in the world here in our own country, as well as the missing link in our national defense program?

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway project has been approved by the finest and most efficient engineers this country has ever known. They made investigation after investigation, survey after survey, and found that since the construction of the Pickwick Dam across the Tennessee River just below the point where this project connects with the Tennessee River, raising the water level at that point by 50 or 55 feet, it made this project absolutely feasible; and that it will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, as well as all points on the Ohio River up to Pittsburgh, Pa., and to all points on the Illinois, the Missouri, the upper Mississippi, and the Tennessee

Rivers, and still save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

It will cut the water distance between Mobile and our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles and cut the cost of transportation between the Gulf at Mobile and the point where this project connects with the Tennessee River by more than 75 percent, of from \$2.79 a ton down to \$0.62 a ton. It will cut the water distance between Mobile and our atomic bomb plant at Paducah, Ky., by more than 300 miles and cut the cost of transportation from \$2.47 a ton down to \$0.89 a ton.

In other words, it will give us a slack-water route from the Gulf to each one of our atomic bomb plants, as well as to all points on the Great Lakes, and to the points I have mentioned on our inland rivers, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic. This project is just as sure to be constructed as the night follows the day, and the sooner it is done the better it is going to be for all concerned, and especially for our boys who are now giving their lives on foreign soil.

They are simply being sacrificed by being compelled to fight with bayonets and gun butts, against a force that can lose 300 or more to our 1, probably 400 to our 1, and fight indefinitely. If that conflict continues, or if we get into war with any other power, our hope for survival is going to be in the airplane and the atomic bomb. We cannot afford to see our boys murdered, as they are being murdered in Korea today, in what they call a police action, which has already cost us more men than we lost in four wars—the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War all combined. In order to provide the airplanes and the atomic bombs necessary for victory, in that police action, or for our defense in case of another world war, it is going to be absolutely necessary to speed up the construction of this great project, in order to provide the transportation to carry the materials necessary to build and maintain the strongest air force on earth, and to supply the atomic bombs necessary for their use.

This project is absolutely necessary.

In addition to its contribution to our national defense it will mean more from a transportation standpoint to the people in the States of the great Middle West, including Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Colorado, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, Montana, and all the other States in that great mid-western area, as well as to all the States in the South from Kentucky to Florida, and from Virginia to Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, than any other project of its kind that has ever been proposed. In fact, it will greatly benefit the people of every State in the Union.

It should be constructed with all possible haste.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, of course I could rise to a question of personal privilege on the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi that I am tied

up with the railroad lobbyists, but no one gives any special credence to statements which he makes.

I will say that never in my life have I seen a railroad lobbyist to know him, and no railroad lobbyist has ever appeared before the committee or had any connection whatever with this bill.

The gentleman from Mississippi was so insistent upon this project that we made one of the most exhaustive investigations that could be made. Our staff of investigators proved, with the Army engineers before the committee, that their figures were erroneous, that the project would cost vastly more than they had estimated, and that the benefit ratio instead of being favorable to the project was below zero.

The report issued by the committee under Judge KERR's chairmanship, and now on file in the document room, shows—

First. The 1950 estimated construction cost of the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway is actually \$205,400,000 instead of the \$179,264,000 as computed by the Corps of Engineers.

Second. The benefit-cost ratio is 0.27 as compared with 1.13 attributed to the project by the corps.

Third. The Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission do not consider the project essential to national defense.

Fourth. Construction of the project as planned will necessitate the replacement of three existing locks below Demopolis at an estimated cost of \$51,000,000, not included in the corps figures. When this cost is used in corps benefit-cost ratio, it drops below unity.

Fifth. Operating conditions across the Mississippi Sound are not safe for barges which would have to use it to reach the proposed waterway as a means of traveling north.

Sixth. The engineers' formula used to compute transportation savings has no basis in reality.

Seventh. The corps estimates delay of 1 hour in passing through the locks, but actual time would be 3½ hours, and would include double-locking and use of auxiliary power not anticipated by the corps.

Eighth. Waterway can be used only by tows up to 3,500 tons or 2,000 horsepower. Tows using the Mississippi exceed this weight and speed.

Ninth. The corps claims shipment of alumina, bauxite, sugar, and petroleum, yet—

(a) No barge has ever been designed to transport alumina.

(b) The bauxite companies do not propose to ship by water.

(c) Major petroleum producers evinced little interest in the project.

(d) Sugar and fertilizer are not moved by water in this area.

Tenth. The Venezuelan iron ore will be shipped to this country at Baltimore and Philadelphia rather than to Mobile and New Orleans because the distances to the northern cities are shorter and the rail transport from there to Pittsburgh cheaper than either the barge or rail transport from the southern locations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is too late to remedy the situation which I now bring to your attention, but I do think we should give it some consideration before we proceed on the next year's appropriation.

I learned the other day from the Army engineers that when appropriations are being considered for maintenance on the various river and harbor projects they go before the committee and justify the maintenance fund and the committee approves this maintenance money. Then when it is given to the Army engineers it is given to them in a lump sum. Now, here is a lump sum appropriation of \$66,965,000 listed as "Current expenses" which I am informed is maintenance money to maintain authorized projects. The Army engineers take that money and decide for themselves where they are going to spend it. If they are not going to spend it on the projects they used to justify the appropriation it should be turned back to the Government or certainly should not be diverted, unless it was shown that the project did not need work.

The situation I complain about is that there are a large number of small projects in my district. The engineers came before the Congress and justified the maintenance money. These projects have been approved by Congress and have been opened up, have in previous years been maintained, and the maintenance money is all needed. But just recently they withdrew and transferred all of the maintenance money from that State to somewhere else which the Army engineers felt was a better place to put it.

That does two or three things that just should not be done. In the first place, it puts the Members of Congress from the various districts where these projects are located in the position of having to go to the Army engineers every year, year after year, to beg them to spend the maintenance money on the very projects they used to justify getting that money.

That occasion came up recently and the whole North Carolina delegation met with them. I was astounded to learn that fact. What happened? They then went back after much ado and conferences and correspondence and so forth, and reconsidered, and came back and said, "We have changed our minds. Some of them do need work, so we are going to bring the money back from where we had transferred it and use it where it is supposed to be used." It is not fair to the Army engineers to put them in that spot in the first place. It is not fair to the Members of Congress to put the Members of Congress in that spot. It is not fair to the people who make investments on these improvements for them to be closed up or the funds withdrawn without any further action or even knowledge by the Congress, which in its wisdom provided the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the law give them the authority to transfer those funds?

Mr. BARDEN. I presume so. The Army engineers are a good organization. They are certainly no worse than we have permitted them to be. What I want to do is stop this foolishness next year.

I do not know where the law is. I did not know that they indulged in these practices until this year. I used to serve on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. But this is a new and bad situation. It brings about confusion. It does not tend toward a wise administration of the funds. It certainly does not safeguard the funds so as to channel them to the projects which were used to justify the appropriation of the fund.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I agree with the gentleman. I also have had the same experience that the gentleman has had.

Mr. BARDEN. I suppose there are some 75 Members of the House who have had the same experience. We cannot correct it this year, but next year we can correct it. I say the Army engineers should not have this discretionary veto power and my record has been one of friendliness to them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have not asked for this time in an endeavor to get any new projects or to ask for any projects that are left out. I have asked for this time, in the first place, again to commend the Committee on Appropriations of the House for its efforts in trying to hold these appropriations down in these times of great expenditures; and secondly, to raise the question about the additions that have been put on in the other body. The House Committee on Appropriations did a splendid job in holding the appropriations down to a necessary minimum. Further cuts were made on the floor. But it appears that the other body has run true to form and raised the appropriations considerably.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the committee, I would appreciate very much some member of the Appropriations Committee giving me the exact amount that the Senate has increased this appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. According to the table here, in answer to the gentleman's question, I would say that the Senate has upped the amount \$124,150,813.

Mr. COLMER. That is to say that the Senate has increased the amount appropriated by the House more than \$124,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday a \$5,000,000,000-plus tax bill, which was some \$10,000,000,000 less than the President asked for was defeated in this House by a substantial majority. No doubt the majority of those who voted against this tax bill did so on the theory that the taxpayer was already overburdened.

With that thought I am in thorough accord, but I call the attention of this House again to the fact that taxes are necessary to finance appropriations. It might be popular to vote for appropriations and against taxes. But every man in this House knows that you cannot spend and spend without having taxes with which to cover the expenditures. I agree that we have just about reached the absorption point in taxes.

There is only one answer, and that is for the Government to curtail expenditures. We cannot spend and spend and spend without increased taxes. There must be further retrenchment and economy in local, State, and National Government, otherwise we face national bankruptcy.

Therefore, sane, common sense demands that we keep these appropriations down to an absolute minimum. There is in the House a group who have worked this entire year trying to trim these appropriations. We have succeeded to a marked degree. But it is very disheartening, after all of our labor over here, to see these bills come back from the other body, which is supposedly the more conservative and sober Chamber, invariably with sharp increases.

I am very much in hopes that this House will recommit this bill and that the House conferees will insist upon the House provisions; thereby saving approximately \$125,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. For if it is appropriated we must have more taxes. We cannot eat our pie and keep it, too.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the project which is partially in my district, known as the New Cumberland lock and dam, was taken out, as I asked that it should be. It was taken out originally by the House and was put back in by the Senate. Did the conference committee take that out?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is such an unusual experience to have a Member of the House ask that a project in his district be eliminated that special note was made of the gentleman's request, and in conference the Senate amendment was rejected. We are glad to cooperate with the gentleman from Ohio. It is to be regretted there are not more who take the same attitude.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to thank the gentleman and say that that project may be very worth while, but it certainly is not necessary at this time. In this time of inflation and high expenditures, we can certainly get along without it, because the Ohio River Channel is sufficiently deep to carry the shipping on it. If the project is brought up at some time when we need employment, it might be a good proposition. This project now would build a new dam to replace two perfectly good dams which operate satisfactorily. I thank the gentleman for not including it in this conference report.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I want to congratulate the gentleman. I think this is the first instance of this kind that has come to my experience in the years I have served in this House.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the committee of conference is to be congratulated for presenting to the House this report. We have made our annual appropriations in all of the bills. I think this is the last one this year. There is not another appropriation bill that has been cut anything like this one was cut by the Civil Function Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, we have not only not cut the other bills 20 percent; we have not cut them 15 percent; we have not cut them 10 percent. No, Mr. Speaker; we made very limited cuts, but what do we hear this morning? Some effort has been made to compare this with certain other bills that we have passed. Now, this bill has no connection with any other appropriation bill, not even the tax bill of yesterday or the appropriation bill for foreign aid. But if you must compare, if you want to compare this bill with others may we make a comparison with the appropriation for the aid and assistance of foreign nations. We appropriated every dime the Bureau of the Budget requested. Not one nickel was cut. I challenge any Member of the House to deny that statement, except I will say that some money was deleted for Korea, on the theory that it would be appropriated a little later. Not a dime was saved. That was for aid and relief of foreign countries. While I voted against that bill because I honestly believed that we were exceeding our financial ability as a nation. I would have supported the bill if a substantial cut had been made. However, this morning we have a bill for the aid and assistance of America. Perhaps the Committee of Conference made mistakes by including some projects here and there which should have been omitted. I do not know. I am as conservative as any Member in this House. I will put my record for conservatism up against the record of any Member of this House or the Senate, but as long as we have such large sums of money to spend in countries abroad, when it comes to spending at home I want to be guided by the Members of this House and the Senate and the folks back home. I am willing to make a few mistakes in their favor.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the committee of conference for the consideration they have extended to my State—Arkansas. All items pending before them have received careful consideration, and I am entirely satisfied. They have done a grand job, and we, the entire delegation from Arkansas, are well pleased and entirely satisfied. I desire especially to thank the committee of

conference for agreeing to the Senate amendment regarding Hardin drain at Pine Bluff in amount of \$265,000 and the amount of \$4,100,000 for the Arkansas River and tributaries. This money is to be used for bank stabilization on the Arkansas River. The money is being allowed by the Congress and will be expended by the Corps of Engineers according to the justification of estimates submitted for bank-stabilization projects on the Arkansas River in the civil functions appropriation bill on eight locations on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and Oklahoma. Of those eight locations, five touch the Sixth Congressional District of Arkansas, which I have the honor to represent in this body. The following is exact information taken from the justification of estimates affecting the five locations within our district:

| Item | Total cost | Allocations | |
|--|------------|------------------|------------------------|
| | | Fiscal year 1952 | After fiscal year 1952 |
| White Bluff to Jefferson County free bridge..... | \$600,000 | \$200,000 | \$400,000 |
| Plum Bayou to Rob Roy..... | 750,000 | 750,000 | ----- |
| Medford..... | 460,000 | 460,000 | ----- |
| Brunson Crossing..... | 580,000 | 580,000 | ----- |
| New Gascony..... | 300,000 | 300,000 | ----- |

For the sake of brevity I do not here include the description of the work contemplated at these five locations, however such descriptions are a part of the Justification of Estimates compiled by the Corps of Engineers and referred to the Senate committee by the Bureau of the Budget, and are on file in the committees of both the Senate and House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report and it ought to be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], a member of the committee.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have inquired concerning the total sum available for planning.

On rivers and harbors the unobligated balance was \$872,926. These funds were frozen projects before they were released. The appropriation which is in the bill is in the sum of \$500,000. This brings the total to \$1,372,926. The Budget estimate for rivers and harbors was \$1,000,000; so the unobligated balance is now raised \$372,926 above the amount requested.

In flood control the unobligated balance was \$3,475,800. To that is added the appropriation in this bill of \$1,000,000, which brings the total to \$4,475,800. The Budget estimate was \$2,500,000. So we have an increase there of about \$2,000,000.

The grand total available for planning is \$5,848,726; whereas the total Budget estimate was \$3,500,000. The increase is due to the unfreezing of funds in both the rivers and harbors and flood control sections.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. I have prepared a motion to recommit which reads as follows:

I move that the conference report on the bill H. R. 4386 be recommitted to the conference committee with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on House amendment No. 15, which is the Jensen amendment.

My inquiry is this: In the event a straight motion to recommit this conference report to the committee of conference is offered, will that foreclose me from offering this motion to recommit with instructions which I have just read, whether the straight motion to recommit is defeated or passed?

The SPEAKER. There can be but one motion to recommit.

Mr. JENSEN. Hence I will be foreclosed from offering this motion?

The SPEAKER. If another motion to recommit is offered and adopted or rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of the chairman if this bill should be recommitted with no specific instructions. It is not possible that no civil-functions bill would be reported and the Department would be forced to operate on a continuing resolution?

Mr. CANNON. The only alternative, of course, would be a further conference with every item in the bill subject to reduction or elimination, or a continuing resolution, assuming that a continuing resolution could be passed.

The enactment of a continuing resolution would involve distressing complications. The current appropriation bill which would be continued is based on last year's construction program. It has not greatly hampered the program to operate on that basis for a few months into this fiscal year but to continue it throughout the year and into the working season of 1952 would result in vastly lessened efficiency in the program and would retard vitally needed projects which are now well on the road to completion. No one at all interested in any provision of the river-and-harbor sections of the bill, or the flood-control provisions, could afford to see the interests of his area subjected to the contingencies which would follow recommitment of the conference report now before the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the committee in charge of this bill has been very anxious to comply with the wishes of every Member of the House and to include all projects and appropriations requested. But had we done so, there has not been enough money in the United States Treasury for peacetime expenditures, beginning with the administration of George Washington and continuing down to the present time, to pay for them. I am certain the Members of the House will understand that we had no choice but to restrict to a minimum the amount we reported. A very definite line had to be drawn somewhere and, as

the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] have explained, that we drew the line by classes and categories, as determined by authorizations, budget estimates, emergencies, relation to national defense programs, and other well-defined lines of demarcation.

And may I, at this point, express the appreciation of all majority members of the subcommittee, of the invaluable service rendered by these two distinguished minority members in the screening of evidence, the preparation of the report, and the drafting of the bill. They were in agreement with the bill as it went to the Senate, and assisted materially in efforts to protect the bill from heavy increases, some of them without authorization of law, many of them without budget estimates, and otherwise unacceptable to the managers on the part of the House. But the Senators insisted they were a part of the United States Government, and, of course, a conference is a matter of compromise, and we had no choice but to yield on many items which were not in consonance with the rules we had followed in assembling the House bill.

The conference report is not acceptable to some because it is not liberal enough and does not include appropriations which have been omitted. It is not agreeable to others because it is too liberal and carries appropriations which they think should have been reduced or eliminated altogether. Let me say to all Members of the House that after months of work on the bill, the committee believes it is the best bill that can be secured under the circumstances. Recommitment would unquestionably result in disadvantages which would outweigh most of the objections advanced here this afternoon. I trust the conference report will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this conference report includes only planning money for Tuttle Creek, one of the dams urgently required to protect the Kansas Cities and other areas so recently devastated by disastrous floods. I had hoped fervently that the conference committee would provide money for the immediate construction of this and other critically necessary projects. The failure to do so but increases the direct responsibility of the Congress for future, as well as past events. We all pray that no further disaster will come to this tragically devastated area.

The conference committee recommends to the Committees on Public Works that immediate consideration be given to the establishment of a Missouri River Basin Survey Commission to make a complete investigation of flood conditions and proposed measures for control thereof in the lower Missouri River Basin area and to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1952.

In view of the failure of this bill to appropriate money for construction of Tuttle Creek and related projects, it is imperative that this survey be made most expeditiously so that the matter may be finally resolved and the heart of America adequately protected against the re-

currence of a disaster, the results of which this Congress has already made clear it will not adequately assist in repairing.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the members of the conference committee who have seen fit to include in the conference report an appropriation for \$1,000,000 for the improvement of the Cuyahoga River, in Cleveland. This appropriation will enable the engineers to remove some of the impediments which prevent long, modern freighters navigating the river to the steel and other industrial plants for the purpose of delivering ore and other raw materials so vitally needed for production for national defense.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the conference report.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit H. R. 4386 to the committee of conference.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 81, noes 138.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—yeas 143, noes 77.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 8, line 5, after "project", insert "": *Provided further*, That not more than \$200,000 of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available to pay to lawful occupants of properties within the towns of Sanish and Van Hook, N. Dak., for their improvements which will be rendered useless by the construction of the project, but for which compensation may not be made under existing law because of the occupants' limited right of occupancy: *Provided further*, That payment in each case

shall be limited to the fair value of the improvements, or the cost of moving such improvements to the site of the new combined town, whichever is less, as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated shall not be expended for the payment of business losses or other losses incident to the acquisition of lands for this project."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

READJUSTMENT OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON PARCEL POST PACKAGES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class—parcel post—mail, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1187)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
M. G. BURNSIDE,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MIKE MONRONEY,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
JOHN M. BUTLER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the House.

TOM MURRAY,
M. G. BURNSIDE,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since the Senate receded and agreed to the House bill, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4473) entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2574) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2574, with Mr. BATTLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on the bill has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are hereby amended by inserting at the end of the above-named sections the following new subsection:

"(c) All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 2, line 6, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the agency head may omit such clause from contracts with foreign contractors for supplies or services procured outside the limits of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, in any case where such omission is deemed necessary to effect a procurement."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before you was adopted by the committee after the report was issued. It was adopted specifically at the request of the Department of Defense and was based upon their experience and

difficulty in security goods and services overseas.

I call attention to the fact that a similar provision is included in the present renegotiation law and a similar provision was in the Renegotiation Act as far back as 1942.

The military has found that on occasion it becomes necessary to acquire goods and services overseas and that foreign contractors have refused to provide those goods and services if renegotiation was insisted upon. For this reason, it was found necessary to exempt such contracts from renegotiation. A similar position is taken with respect to permitting inspection by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does it not seem to the gentleman that there is something inherently unfair to United States contractors to require that they be subjected to a review of their contract, and to the provisions of this bill, when we exempt foreign corporations from the same provisions? It just strikes me that we are not playing fair with our people when we do that sort of thing.

Mr. HARDY. We would prefer that American contractors be given every advantage that foreign contractors are given. However, we have to be mindful of practical considerations.

If it is necessary to acquire some item, or some service from a foreign contractor to service an overseas contingent of our military forces, and that contractor refuses to supply it unless he is exempted from these provisions, then it would seem to me that the dictates of wisdom would require that we exempt such contract if the acquisition of the item is of sufficient importance.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman mean to imply that there are items which can be furnished by foreign corporations, and which cannot be furnished by United States corporations, which make it necessary for us to yield to this stubborn insistence on the part of foreign corporations?

Mr. HARDY. There have been instances of that kind. There have been times when certain items were acquired by the military, which were available from foreign corporations, and which were not produced by United States corporations, at least in adequate quantity.

Mr. KEATING. I do not want to inquire into any privileged matter, or other matters which should not be disclosed. But, does that situation exist today when our rearmament program has been speeded up, that there are still items which cannot be supplied in this country or by United States suppliers, which make it necessary for us to yield to this position taken by foreign contractors?

Mr. HARDY. I can think at the moment of only one item on which I have personal information, which is currently being procured from United States contractors, and simultaneously being procured from overseas contractors because our production is not sufficiently great. I presume there may be many others.

Mr. KEATING. Has it been represented to the gentleman in that one case,

that it is not possible for us to procure an adequate supply from our own contractors?

Mr. HARDY. That is the understanding I have. Here is another type of case, which although it is a hypothetical case, could easily arise, and I presume does frequently arise. If we have a contractor performing certain construction work overseas, and we should be temporarily short of a particular article because of shipping delays or for some other reason has not arrived, and it was then found that a local foreign supplier might be able to furnish that article, and that contractor should say they would furnish this article at a certain price. If we should say that we would have to see their books and records, he could just decline to make it available to us, and we would be stymied in the procurement of that item.

Mr. KEATING. The unwillingness of a foreign supplier to permit such an inspection raises in my mind a serious question as to whether we should let a contract to that supplier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to make this observation. The amendment specifically prescribes that this provision in the contract may be omitted when the head of an agency finds it is necessary to effect a procurement. Of course, this is a provision which should be exercised with caution and with the best judgment the responsible individual possesses.

I hope the amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] has expired.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes in order that I may propound a question to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I would like to ask the gentleman: Is it not true that in the bill as drafted subcontractors are made subject to the provisions of the bill the same as the initial contractors?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. HARVEY. Just using an illustration. I am trying to point up some of the defects in the operation of this bill should it become law: A gentleman in my district makes a gadget which is purchased by Allison Motors in Indianapolis, a subdivision of General Motors. He makes that gadget in great quantities. Allison is the prime contractor for the Government. This man sells to a lot of other people, including Allison, this particular gadget. Does that mean that

this man, who, in a sense, would be said to be a subcontractor, would be subject to having all of his books opened up for inspection by Government officials?

Mr. HARDY. It would depend on whether he was simply selling a few items or whether he was contracting to sell a number of items.

Mr. HARVEY. Is the bill sufficiently well written to set forth that distinction that the gentleman has made?

Mr. HARDY. I think it should be clearly understood that it is not contemplated that a contractor who might have to buy some casual item in connection with the performance of a contract would expect that that particular individual should open his books.

Mr. HARVEY. I am not thinking particularly of an obvious intent of fraud. I hope the gentleman understands that. But the point I am making is that a great many times we enact these laws with utmost good faith, and when they come to be interpreted by the agencies downtown on the Avenue, they take an entirely different attitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] has again expired.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] is recognized.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. It is true that today I have been assured by the chairman of the subcommittee, in whom I have complete confidence and whose work certainly deserves the commendation of this Congress, that there has been in the past at least one instance in which the provisions of the proposed bill would have been harmful in procuring for the United States some material which was badly needed. However, to be consistent, I must report that I opposed this amendment in committee. I opposed it on principle, as well as in actuality.

It seems to me basically unfair and discriminatory to put upon American business, restrictions which we refuse to put on foreign industry. My first opposition in committee was based on this proposed discrimination against American business. Aside from the fact that the amendment proposes such discrimination, it seems to me also to offer unlimited danger. There is nothing in my experience with the way in which foreign business is conducted which would lead me to think that contracts made without this safeguard abroad would be any more trustworthy or free from chicanery or corruption than similar contracts made with American business which, after all, does have in the main a high code of business ethics.

I am speaking with some experience. The only business contracts with which I have personally ever been in close touch have been contracts made with foreign industry. With a light touch I would remind you of the old story—not completely apocryphal—that many

businesses abroad have been known to keep three kinds of books: those for themselves, those for the tax collector, and those by which they wish to sell the business. That may be going a little to extremes, nor would I seem to condemn foreign business conduct in blanket fashion. I do say, however, that contracts abroad are written on a different basis of business ethics than American contracts.

I think therefore that there is danger in giving to those with authority to make our commitments, power to make such contracts abroad without the safeguard that we have thought necessary to impose on contracts made with our own businessmen at home.

This morning the chairman of the subcommittee did me the courtesy of calling to tell me the instance which led him to think that this amendment was necessary. I am unable, however, to bring myself to think that because of an emergency it is necessary to accept a procedure which is inherently wrong. I am going beyond that. I think that as responsible representatives of the American people we have no right because of an emergency to change the general code of conduct for our business relations. I strongly feel that if it is necessary in the interest of integrity or economy to put this safeguard and restriction on American business, it is even more necessary that the same safeguards and restrictions be put upon those foreign businesses with which we are making contracts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Having had some experience as a procurement officer in dealing with foreign concerns, I have the feeling that there is a greater necessity for this legislation with regard to contracts made with foreign corporations than there is with those in this country. I agree with the gentlewoman that in the vast majority of cases our own business people are fair and honest in all their dealings, and I make no allegations to the contrary with regard to foreign corporations; but, certainly if we are going to impose this obligation upon our own business people we should do it with regard to foreign corporations with whom our country deals.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman whose great experience as procurement officer substantiates my own fear of this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say at the very beginning that I have the utmost confidence in the GAO. I knew the head of GAO when he served here in the House, and no one, so far as I have ever been able to learn, has ever questioned either his ability, his sincerity, or his integrity. But it does not follow that every employee in GAO cannot make a mistake, or has no improper motive in connection with his work.

I have noticed in connection with some of the investigations which have been instigated or carried on by GAO or some

of its employees that they can be just as arbitrary, just as unfair, just as wasteful, just as deceitful, as any of the employees of some of the other agencies. In fact, I have had occasion to observe some of their work. One of their top men is what might be described as a know-it-all. He seems to resent the fact that a Congressman may have an independent thought or does not accept his conclusion without question. And from the way some of them operate it appears they are more interested in making work for the GAO than in doing a job.

The House has always been opposed to these unnecessary snooping expeditions by committee staffs or by the bureaucrats down town; and yet here we come along with a bill under the guise of doing something to protect the taxpayers which would let the GAO go into everybody's business and look it over if they just wanted to take a look at it. In one instance they spent about a week on a job that needed but a fraction of that time. Let me repeat, it is all right to have GAO look into many situations, for GAO is the arm of Congress; it is the only agency, or the most effective agency we have against fraud and extravagance and waste and all those things; it is absolutely necessary, but that is no reason, at least to my mind, why we should give them unlimited authority to go everywhere and snoop into everybody's business. GAO has many employees and it may need the same kind of an overhauling that the Internal Revenue Bureau so greatly needs. Some of these GAO boys are getting swelled heads, they seem to think they are indispensable, when in truth and in fact some are not even ornamental. Some are getting into a frame of mind where they act as though congressional committees cannot function without them, and it sure costs money to have them around. Now, after providing that they may go into the books of our own people, they come along with an amendment and in effect, say: That is all right, we must do that, but we do not want to let you look at a foreigner's books, the books of any foreigner who has a sub-contract.

Where do you get to then? Let us take an illustration. Here is a contract that requires three items for its completion. Two are furnished by subcontractors here in America. One by a contractor abroad. The GAO under this bill can go into the books of our own people and ask and get from them anything and everything they want, but they cannot go into the books of the fellow abroad who furnishes the third item.

They say: Well, they, the folks abroad, will not bid on it. With all the billions and billions of dollars that we are giving to these other countries and to the people of those other countries, it is a strange situation when they will not do business with us except on their own terms. What has become of our bargaining sense? Is international trade a one-way street? What are we? Beggars?

We might better go back to the days of David Harum who always got something when he made a trade. If we are

going to give them a contract over there, there is no reason why we should not protect the American taxpayers against graft from those people as well as from our own. If you say they will not deal with us, all right, they do not need to, then we will not give them any more money. I cannot see any reason why we should give billions and billions of dollars away if we do not get something in return, even if the old horse we get is wind-broken, blind, heavy and has but three legs.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has a commercial instinct down there. I do not see why he does not drive a bargain. Get something for what we give.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is speaking beside the point on this. This is purely a practical matter. If we can provide it from our own contractors, all well and good; but if we should find it necessary to acquire material from a foreign contractor overseas, we do not want to cut our own throats.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I get the gentleman's point. Sure, the fellow over there says: We will not give you this third essential item that you need if you are going to snoop into our books and find out what it costs or what will be a fair price or what profit we make.

My answer is: Why do you deal with them? Why do you give them all of these billions of dollars, not only on that particular thing, but just hand money out to them, shovel it out to them? So why should we give them something more—permit them when we want something to say they will not deal with us except on their terms.

Oh, I cannot figure it out. The gentleman grows peanuts and cotton down there, I think peanuts. The people get a price for their peanuts, but he says they must not profit too much, but when it comes to dealing with the taxpayers' money on a big contract abroad they say: "Oh, we are helpless. If the peanuts are mixed with something which only the British and the French have while we will see that the Virginia peanut grower does not profit too much, we will not let GAO ask our foreign friends to charge for what they put into the mixture."

Where did Patrick Henry come from? Did he not come from that part of the country? Was he not the fellow who told them off? But are the Virginians to go under the table now and say: No, we will give you from abroad anything you ask if you just come along with us, you need not deal fairly, you can be a war profiteer if you wish, but as for our own people we will see that they do not get more than enough to pay their taxes?

I cannot figure it out and I do not see why you want to do these unfair things to our own people while letting foreign contractors skin us alive.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the debate it seems to me that some of us believe that by this amendment we are going to do a disservice to a foreign business. We do appreciate in the beginning

that contracts will be let to foreign governments only under certain circumstances; that is, when it is absolutely necessary to procure something that is needed.

The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That the agency head may omit such clause from contracts with foreign contractors for supplies or services procured outside the limits of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, in any case where such omission is deemed necessary to effect a procurement.

It is only under those circumstances that this provision will ever be used. The power is given to an American agency head to omit such clause from a foreign contract in any case where such omission is deemed necessary to effect procurement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is absolutely right when he refers to the agency head. But who tells him what to do? The State Department. Who determines that policy? Acheson.

Mr. DAWSON. I have no reply against that type of argument.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that there is an essential fallacy in the gentleman's argument which may be because of the gentleman's possible unfamiliarity with the types of cases where procurement will be sought overseas.

During World War II, it was the policy of our Government, and very properly so, to procure everything possible under reverse lend-lease overseas from foreign contractors. It was not just emergency items. Now, I assume that today, under the Mutual Assistance Act, every effort will be made to have our foreign friends supply as much as possible to us under their participation in the mutual-assistance program. I do not think these procurements will be limited only to emergency items. I think it is very likely to be a widespread program, and, if that is true, if the policy is going to be the same as it was in World War II, then we are opening the door here to procurement abroad on entirely different terms from the method of procurement at home and on terms more favorable to foreign contractors than to our domestic contractors.

Mr. DAWSON. In the light of the experience of the gentleman as a procurement officer, I am more in favor of this amendment than ever, knowing the type of officer that he would be. As head of that agency I have every reason to believe that if you were given this power you would think in terms of the protection of your Government and not in terms of giving something away to a foreign power. So we have provided that the agency head, the procurement officer, such as the gentleman would be, may omit such clause from contracts with foreign contractors in any case where it is necessary to effect procurement. I am sure that you, as a procure-

ment officer, would never have abused the trust that this Government placed in you when they gave you the power of a procurement officer, and you would use an amendment like this to protect your Government, and only give a contractor the benefit of this in case where it was necessary to protect your Government, and not in the interest of some foreign power.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those very kind things the gentleman from Illinois has said; I deeply do, and I appreciate the force of the argument that he has put forth. However, it is not a question of the procurement officer in the field. He, of course, presumably, will do a conscientious job. The orders come from Washington, or did, and very properly so, in my judgment, in World War II. Everything possible must be procured from the country; indigenous products must be used to the greatest extent possible, and it is not a question of the man on the ground protecting the Government. It is the fact that there will be a large number of these procurements for which the same protection should exist as for domestic procurement.

Mr. DAWSON. The answer to that is that just as in World War II, the head of the agency gave the procurement officer in the field the ability to make contracts. So it is in this day and time. They will no more be made here in Washington now than they were made in your time, but the head here will give to the authority in the field the right to make the contract to protect this Government wherever it is deemed necessary. Certainly that matter would not be tried here but would be handled by the procurement officer on the ground.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want, first, to commend the very able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], for the splendid work he did in bringing this particular bill to the floor. I think it is an excellent bill, and I am very much in favor of it.

However, I am very much disturbed about this amendment the gentleman was asked to place on this bill, that limits the investigatory work of the General Accounting Office to contracts within the United States. At the time this bill was presented to our full committee for consideration, I asked what examples of foreign contracts there were that needed this sort of provision in order for us to obtain such contracts, so that it would not interfere with our defense efforts. The answer, of course, was that there were no specific examples. The chairman of the committee read a letter of very general nature saying that the Defense Department just wanted it that way. I asked whether the committee or its staff had made any further inquiry to find out just what they were talking about, because if there were no contracts that might be interfered with that would affect our defense I wanted to know about it, but in typical fashion there was nothing specific.

As a member of the committee I must report to the House that the committee

itself found nothing specific in its hearing. The chairman has told me personally that since that time a couple of matters were called to his attention. I am not going to divulge their nature other than to say that in both instances they were what I would term emergency situations. This amendment is not limited to emergency situations at all. It refers to any case where such omission is necessary to make a purchase. It does not say that the purchase is absolutely vital or necessary. Even if it were an emergency, I sort of shy away from that word after having been in a period of 20 years of emergency. I doubt very much if this Administration knows what the word "emergency" really means.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. This is an amendment to the Armed Services Procurement Act.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Of course, our armed services procure vegetables and similar things all over Europe for our forces.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. Would not that come under this provision?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know why it should not.

Mr. VORYS. We were told in our hearings of very substantial purchases the armed services are making particularly in Japan, where the purchases by our armed services are a great boon to their economy. My question is, would not all that procurement come under this provision?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly it would come under this provision, just like any procurement abroad. I wish someone would tell me why we should not have the right to follow through on those contracts if we are going to spend the money. If these people abroad are our friends, as everyone indicates they are, we having spent so much money over there, if they are really our friends and it comes down to an issue of where we need an emergency purchase, and they will not give it to us because of this requirement that we insist upon with our own contractors, all I can say is that we have not procured very firm friends. It is a real question in my mind whether we do have those firm friends.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield, I think I fully understand and appreciate the sincerity on which the gentleman is basing his discussion. I, too, am concerned about granting any preferences under this type of legislation. I dislike very much to find it necessary to do so. However, I should like to refer just for a moment to the illustration made by our colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] a moment ago. Suppose, for instance, a contractor should say, "We will not furnish these vegetables if you are going to inspect our books." Are we going to undertake to ship all those vegetables from here over there?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. I suggest we handle that situation as we should handle it. I think if they are

so anxious to get the American dollar we are not going to have that particular problem.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. What would be the status of a contract made in a foreign country with a company which is in fact a subsidiary of an American company?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is exactly the way you could get around the provisions of this bill if this amendment is adopted. I think this is a real contribution to this discussion, because that is what I fear, among other things.

Mr. HARDY. I wish I had the answer to that one.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, very briefly.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I would like to ask the gentleman the same question I asked the previous speaker, namely, What would be the status of a contract made in a foreign country with a firm, which is in fact a subsidiary of an American firm?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You could not go into their books under this amendment, if it is adopted.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That would be a great loophole then.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To me, the absurdity of this amendment, or at least I think it is an absurdity, can be recognized if you take this illustration. We all remember in World War II, we appropriated money to buy cigarettes for the armed services abroad. It was necessary, we said, and it affected their morale adversely so we were told if they did not get their tobacco. There is a tobacco product, I understand, a plug tobacco. I do not know how they make it. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], my very good friend, knows. By the way, I want to compliment and express confidence in not only the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HARDY], but in all the members of the committee, and all members of all other committees for that matter—yes, in the whole House of Representatives, and especially in my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

Now suppose they want to buy some tobacco, some chewing tobacco, or plug tobacco over there? You can have a contractor abroad. We buy of him. He gets the tobacco from the Virginia planters, or the jobbers, or whoever has it for sale here. He has it shipped over there and makes a contract to sell the cigarettes and the chewing tobacco to our services for the use of our men and the few who are sent by other nations in Korea or next week in Europe. You can go into the grower's, the jobber's

books if he is an American to find out what he is getting out of it. But if the contractor or anyone over there adds a little molasses or "flavoring something," or whatever it is, they put into chewing tobacco, you cannot ask that foreign contractor or subcontractor whether or not they are gouging us. It gives them an unfair advantage. It lets them trim us clear down to the bone. What I think is troubling the gentleman from Virginia, and those who are supporting this bill, is they are just afraid; and they do not have confidence enough in our own people, and those who deal for us, to believe that our bargaining agents have the ability, can hold these people abroad, and make them give us a fair deal. Either that or they want to strip our own people of all opportunities to make a fair profit, but are willing to let a foreign outfit skin us. It goes back to the argument I made awhile ago.

We are on the giving end all the time, sending money and our resources and our men abroad, not for our benefit—not for our benefit, but primarily for the benefit of the other countries and these other people. Then when to help them we need something and they refuse to deal fairly—we drop down on our backs, roll our eyes, and beg them not to gouge us too deeply. Why is it that all the time in everything we do, we must extend to them a special privilege? We impose upon our people, and our manufacturers and dealers the duty of turning their books inside out, any snooper from the General Accounting Office who may want to come along, may strut his stuff, show his authority, make everyone turn his files inside out—examine the books of our people—yet, we say that the books and the fraudulent cheating operations, if any there be, of those who happen to live abroad, and with whom we happen to make a contract, cannot be examined. I think it is time we treated our own people a little more fairly. That we do not extend all of the privileges and the immunities, the right to do business, to the people who happen to live across the sea. I just cannot understand it, unless we are so fearful of what may happen to us if we do not kiss their feet or their foot or whatever way you want to put it—all the time they will frown or—most disastrous of all—refuse to accept our money. The difficulty I have, and it grows and grows on me all the time is that here are these fighting Virginians ready to fight at the drop of a hat—in years gone by—for America, but today anything that Britain or any other nation wants must be given. Figure it out—can you? Are you going to go over now and fight Egypt for control of the Suez Canal? Are you going down there and fight in Iran for the oil? Do you intend to force open the door in Iran, in Egypt, as Acheson-Marshall did in China—so that Russia may walk in? When are you going to quit, if you keep on this way? They will have us in a war all over the world. Is that necessary in order that Truman may be elected in 1952? The first thing you know, we will be fighting West Virginia. Someone here the other day introduced a bill, I think

it was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I do not know what he was going to do with West Virginia—it was for the purpose of taking them in—was it not?

Mr. HARDY. We would even welcome the State of Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And we would be glad to join you—when you get out of the habit of voting the Democratic ticket when a New Dealer heads it. This bill, Mr. Chairman, ought to be sent back to committee as was that bill yesterday. All you gentlemen who voted in the years gone by for all appropriations, then when the thing caught up with you and you learned that we had to have more taxes voted "no" were on the hot spot because the result of your votes caught up with you. Nobody objected much when you voted for appropriations, but when you reached down into the taxpayers' pocket and began to take out 11 percent more, then you heard from the folks, and so the people who have been voting for appropriations, voted "no." They reformed. They hit the sawdust trail. They became Christians and voted "no." The bad thing about it from the standpoint of those big appropriation boys was that when you counted the "no" votes they were in the majority. The church just would not hold all the Christians. Now they are over here trying to find some way to get out of that dilemma they got themselves into. One remedy is to quit voting for appropriations all the time. But the leadership need not worry. Before the week is over there will be enough backsliders so that the action can be reversed. There will be plenty of room in the church for the "no" voters after the CIO boss has herded them outside—to carry out its deal with the New Deal politicians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDY) there were—ayes 38, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON: On page 2, line 2, after the word "shall", insert the following: "Until the expiration of 3 years after final payment."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered is not intended to restrict the act but simply to clarify and to write into the bill the well established principle of a time limitation. By writing this into the bill there can be no misunderstanding as to the intent of Congress and this will eliminate the uncertainty of how long records must be kept. It will also tend to serve as notice on contractors that they are expected to preserve their records for this period of time. Contracts of this kind are frequently financed through banks and if

we remove uncertainties we implement credit and so aid production.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was discussed in general debate a few days ago. The effect of it would be to put a 3-year limitation of time within which the General Accounting Office would have to inspect the books and records. I have discussed the matter with several members of the committee and everyone I have discussed it with is agreeable to it. So we are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY: On page 2, line 6, after the period, at the end of the sentence, insert a sentence as follows: "The above authority shall not apply to a manufacturer or processor who is a supplier of material to a primary contractor and who is not a subcontractor."

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, in further pursuance of the colloquy I had with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], I want to explain the import of this amendment.

I have previously served on the very fine Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and worked very harmoniously with the gentleman from Virginia. I have high regard for the intent of this bill. I was a member of the subcommittee that drafted this Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and I feel that I have a little right to speak on it and know something about it.

What are you going to do if you do not restrict it by the language that I have offered in this amendment? If you do not restrict it to prime contractors and subcontractors as such, you are going to turn every manufacturer in this country almost without exception over to the GAO for inspection, for everybody in some minor capacity is a supplier of some goods that eventually find their way into defense production; so you are virtually going to subject our entire industrial economy to the scrutiny of the GAO. Some little contractor or manufacturer who may be using only 10 percent of his capacity for the production of goods for the prime contractor, but because of that—and he cannot afford to keep a separate set of books for that 10 percent—it means that every section of his books will have to come under the complete scrutiny of the GAO. He is going to be harassed no end to try to break down production costs and show the details on that 10 percent of his production that went into the general program of defense. While I credit the author of the bill with the very best of intentions, I do not think he understands or fully appreciates what the ultimate effect will be upon our economy

if every person who is manufacturing anything is going to have to supply all the answers to the GAO on everything that he manufactures, and such is literally going to be the impact of the bill if this amendment is not included. I hope the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman's amendment is sound because I happen to know suppliers in a particular field who when they are asked to supply \$15 or \$20 worth of some material to a Government agency and are asked to make out 16 forms in triplicate, they simply say, "No; we will not do it."

I also wonder why the committee did not decide to put in some sort of minimum to which this would not apply, simply to take care of the odd purchases that are made, and must necessarily be made, by Government agencies, small amounts where the established seller is simply not going to open his books for some such small purchase.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman; that is a very pertinent point.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is totally unnecessary and unjustified. I recognize the motive which has prompted the gentleman from Indiana in offering it, but certainly this bill does not propose that the GAO scrutinize every individual purchase transaction from a company. In the first place, it would be absolutely impossible for the General Accounting Office even to consider examining the books and records of all individual suppliers who supply some small items to the prime contractor; it is not intended to cover that type of operation at all. On the other hand, to make the amendment as broad as the gentleman from Indiana has suggested would make it impossible frequently to obtain information which would be vital in a study of a contract. For instance, take this automotive parts proposition as one illustration, an automobile dealer who had a prime contract with the Government. He sublet a part of it to a supply house and the supply house had an additional subcontract with a toolmaker, and so on all the way down the line until profit after profit was pyramided in that proposition. In that case, incidentally, there was involved a little matter of \$100,000 that somebody got who was not entitled to it, and it is not too clear that Uncle Sam did not have to pay it.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Without appearing to dispute the gentleman's statement, may I offer this suggestion: That after all, if that condition prevails probably the fault lies with the initial procurement and not with the method of supply?

Mr. HARDY. I think the fault lies in both.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. If I can understand the English language, the language you have in this bill that I am now reading from, supports the gentleman from Indiana 100 percent. Listen to what it says. Here is what it says:

The GAO shall have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts.

Mr. HARDY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he started too late in reading. I am perfectly willing to stop there if the gentleman will start at the beginning. It requires there shall be a clause inserted in the contract. Obviously if it is an item or two purchased without any contract, why it could not be covered under this law.

Mr. HILL. Where is the gentleman reading from? I am reading from the bill the gentleman proposes to have me vote on and it says "all contractors."

Mr. HARDY. It says:

All contracts negotiated without advertising shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General—

And so forth. That right is given him in the contract. The right is not given him in the bill.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask a question to be sure. I refer to a firm in my own town that makes a certain type of equipment. Most of their work is done under a subcontractor's contract. They will not come under this bill at all?

Mr. HARDY. I think I would have to know a little bit more about it.

Mr. HILL. All I know is that he bids on this material and furnishes it.

Mr. HARDY. If he holds a contract with a prime contractor or directly with the Government, that contract, presumably, would contain this clause.

Mr. HILL. Would they come out to that little town and examine all of his books because he happens to be making a few pieces of equipment for a subcontractor in New York City?

Mr. HARDY. If that contract is negotiated it would have to contain this clause. If it is a bid contract with advertising it would not contain this clause.

Mr. HILL. If the contract is negotiated with this firm in New York City and this firm in Colorado had a subcontract, would they come out to Fort Collins, examine the man's books, separate out the type of material he sends, furnishes, or supplies on this prime contract that he made with the prime contractor? That is the question I am asking.

Mr. HARDY. I am not sure I fully understand the question which the gentleman has raised. The bill is perfectly clear. On contracts that are negotiated without advertising the General Accounting Office would have a right to inspect. Obviously, the General Accounting Office cannot inspect all these contractors nor would there be any purpose to do so.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman has me more mixed up now than before I asked

the question. I would like to know the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no one can question the purpose of the subcommittee or of the subcommittee chairman in connection with this bill, nor their sincerity in the matter. The whole thing arises out of the belief—and if I am incorrect I want the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to set me right—that the Federal employees who negotiate these contracts are no match for the people on the other end of the deal, those who negotiate for private enterprise. Is that not right? That is what gives rise to this?

Mr. HARDY. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This bill is based upon the thought that the Federal employees who negotiate these contracts are no match for the people who represented private corporations or individuals?

Mr. HARDY. I think that is one factor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You see, the bill rests upon the proposition, which the gentleman admits, that the people in the employ of this administration are either so incompetent or so dishonest, or so ill-informed, that they cannot protect Uncle Sam's interests when they write a contract. Instead of a bill of this kind being the remedy, obviously the answer is to discharge these incompetents or dishonest employees and get competent ones, some qualified ones, even if they be Republicans, some who do not act from political motives, employees who will act for and in the interest of the country.

Recent events show the need for employees and officials who are competent, honest, loyal, and whose service in the administration will not be interrupted by indictment and conviction, or whose discharge will not be forced because of malfeasance or improper conduct. It may be well to follow that policy. Even a little integrity in the administration would, as an example, be helpful. What the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], I think, is trying to do—and I think the amendment should be adopted—is this: If someone out in the country makes a contract for, as he said, an item which may be 10 percent of the total production, that under this bill, if it goes through, the GAO can send someone out there and go through the books, not only with reference to that one item of 10 percent which went into production for the Government, but into all of his other business where that same item was used. The gentleman wishes to prevent that practice. In the end then, will we not find ourselves in a situation where it is costing the Government far more to carry on this investigation, at least, costing the taxpayers in wasted time and money far more than the Government will ever be able to save, because this bill applies, as I understand, to transactions after the obligation to pay the money has been incurred,

I have this week, and it is typical, in the office, a case in a small town in the fourth district of Michigan. Here is a manufacturer who wants to increase wages. So he makes application to the Stabilization Board and he runs into all kinds of trouble. Down into his place of business—and there has never been any trouble there and there is not now—come the investigators for the Labor Department, the War Labor Board fellows, and then, how they go into it, I do not know, but a fellow from the internal revenue agency and one from the Food and Drug Agency, now think of it, on one item of business that went through that plant and are the Government's men impudent, arrogant, and arbitrary? Ask the owner. Now they just take the company's time, and when you multiply that by thousands or hundreds of thousands of instances—and they can be multiplied that way—you can see how necessary and vital production is slowed. We do not want, we do not need, any more snoopers going around bothering the honest, patriotic citizens who are engaged in production to carry on the war.

The amendment seems to be reasonable and sound.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I tried to state this many times, that we are not anticipating that the General Accounting Office could possibly go into all of these things, but they would have the right to do it if they had any reason to suspect fraud or bad faith or illegality.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When does an agency not have someone on its staff who has, in his own mind, reason to suspect? Is there an agency which does not have some who think it their duty to suspect, to snoop, to show their authority—whose heads like that of a certain gentleman from Missouri are not swollen? They suspect all honest citizens, but people abroad, oh, they are all right; you must not do anything to offend them, and proceed on the theory, especially the Internal Revenue agents that they must keep doing something—and we begin to know what they are now—proceed on the theory that every taxpayer is a crook, and that more and more people are seeking to evade their just taxes. If people seek means of lessening their taxes, I think it is due to the fact that they are becoming convinced that this Administration has been spending too many, not millions, but billions of dollars wastefully, and they became resentful. We all want to pay our taxes if we think they are being used properly, but when they are used to pay incompetent and crooked officials, as is being demonstrated from week to week the people do not want any more of it.

I think the amendment ought to be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARVEY) there were—ayes 56, noes 40.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. HARVEY and Mr. HARDY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 2, line 2, after the word "any", insert the word "directly."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I personally have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand the other day when I discussed it with the gentleman, that while this amendment was not all that it should be, it was the best that he could think of. Certainly, it was the best—well, I was rather forced to accept it and to agree with him.

The purpose is to limit the "snooping" that may be carried on under this bill which we do not have the votes to defeat.

Mr. HARDY. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In that case, I will not argue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BATTLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5274) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDY) there were—ayes 101, noes 20.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1849 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are hereby amended by inserting at the end of the above-named sections the following new subsection:

"(c) All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 921 and insert the provisions of H. R. 2574 as agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby H. R. 2574 was passed were vacated, and that bill laid on the table.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 2574.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS OF COMMON INTEREST WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 36, Rept. No. 1202), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted on May 12, 1951, a resolution reading as follows: "The Assembly,

"Considering that the peoples of Europe and of the United States have many vital problems in common,

"considering that the solidarity between them arises not only from the common dangers they have to face, but is also the reflection of their common origin, and of their community of thought and civilization,

"taking note that the Committee of Ministers in their Message to the Assembly has

declared that it would welcome any initiative of the Assembly designed to establish links with the Congress of the United States,

"believing that it would be of the greatest interest for public opinion in the democracies if these problems of common interest were to be discussed by delegations from the two Houses of Congress of the United States and from the Consultative Assembly,

"Instructs its Bureau
"To approach the Congress of the United States through the Speakers of both Houses for the purpose of arranging such a discussion to take place in public, preferably in Strasbourg, or, if for any reason circumstances make it desirable, in Washington, at a date mutually convenient, and in accordance with an agenda drawn up in advance by agreement between the officers of the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Consultative Assembly"; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has formally declared it to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe; and

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States to encourage consultation between the Congress of the United States and the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States welcomes this invitation and expresses its appreciation of the unanimous action of the Consultative Assembly in extending it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representatives appointed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe for public discussion of problems of common interest, as envisioned by the resolution of the Consultative Assembly of May 12, 1951. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the Senate, the House, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed \$15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, etc., be authorized to correct the title of the bill so as to read: "To amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HARRIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understood the unanimous-consent request just made was to amend the title with reference to the amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. CROSSER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Did the gentleman include the Unemployment Insurance Act also?

Mr. CROSSER. No, sir. This is just what I showed you. That is all that is necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. I regret I did not see it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND SECTION 503 (B) OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3298) an act to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, lines 4 and 5, strike out "mail or otherwise without examination of the patient" and insert "mail."

Page 3, line 19, strike out all after "sentence" down to and including "prohibited" in lines 21 and 22.

Page 4, after line 5, insert:

"Sec. 2. Subsection (c) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: 'or (4) for having violated section 301 (b), (c) or (k) by failure to comply with section 502 (f) in respect to an article received in interstate commerce to which neither section 503 (a) nor section 503 (b) (1) is applicable, if the delivery or proffered delivery was made in good faith and the labeling at the time thereof contained the same directions for use and warning statements as were contained in the labeling at the time of such receipt of such article.'"

Page 4, line 6, strike out "2" and insert "3."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5131) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "herein" and insert "therein."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and of course I will not object, do I understand from the gentleman from Maryland that this bill provides the necessary legislation to provide a bridge for the crossing of the Delaware River, which would join the Pennsylvania Turnpike and the New Jersey Turnpike?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course I have no objection to the passage of such a bill. It will provide increased facilities for the movement of transportation between the two States and is entitled to the unanimous support of the Congress and the approval of the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN FOR WORKING ON HOLIDAYS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 264) to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking for the consideration of this bill is that on September 24, 1951, the House passed H. P. 4859, to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays, which was identical to S. 264.

In order to facilitate action on the bill I ask that the House pass the Senate bill, which was passed by the Senate on August 27, 1951, and referred to the House District Committee on September 12, 1951.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under regulations promulgated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia when he may be required to work 6 or more hours on any holiday, shall be entitled to receive as compensation for such

holiday work, in lieu of his regular pay for that day, an amount equal to twice his daily rate of basic compensation: *Provided,* That no such officer or member shall be entitled to additional compensation for such holiday work for any day for which he is entitled to receive additional compensation under the provisions of Public Law 13, Eighty-second Congress, approved March 27, 1951. So much of such compensation for such holiday work as is in excess of the regular pay for such day shall not be considered as salary for the purpose of computing retirement compensation or relief payments under section 12 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1916, as amended, nor shall such excess compensation be subject to deduction as provided in section 5 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930, as amended. Appropriations for personal services for the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the White House Police force, and the United States Park Police force shall be available for payment of the additional compensation authorized by this act.

SEC. 2. As used in this act the word "holiday" means the following: The 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 4th day of July, the 30th day of May, the first Monday in September, the 11th day of November, Thanksgiving Day, the 25th day of December, and such other days designated by Executive order.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the White House Police force and the United States Park Police force, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 763), as amended (title V, U. S. C., sec. 84), are hereby made applicable to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATION OF THE CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4467) to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following named persons:

Hon. Albert Rains, Gadsden, Ala.; Miss Ruth James, Gadsden, Ala.; Hoyt G. Irving, 512 Hoatson Street, Warren, Ariz.; Miss Mary Capps, Nogales, Ariz.; Claude M. Hirst, Prescott, Ark.; Mrs. Gertrude Scott, 1123 Stratford Avenue, South Pasadena, Calif.; Howard W. Scott, Box 122, Palsade, Colo.; Benjamin Sherman, Hartford, Conn.; Miss Catherine Flynn, Meriden, Conn.; Hon. J. Caleb Boggs, 1250 Kynlyn Drive, Wilmington, Del.; Mrs. Ruth F. Henderson, Seaford, Del.; Charles

A. Henderson, Seaford, Del.; Charles G. Lavin, Jacksonville, Fla.; Miss Utha Gray Smith, Orange Court Hotel, Orlando, Fla.; Col. K. N. Parkinson, Blackfoot, Idaho; Hon. Addison T. Smith, Twin Falls, Idaho;

Arnold M. Lederer, 5222 North Christiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Miss Charlotte A. Marr, 6327 North Okato Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. Ralph Harvey, rural route 4, Newcastle, Ind.; Hon. Charles A. Halleck, 604 Jefferson Street, Rensselaer, Ind.; Mrs. Esther Costa, Indianapolis, Ind.; Hon. Bourke Blakemore Hickenlooper, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Hon. Ben Franklin Jensen, Exira, Iowa; Hon. Andrew F. Schoepel, 115 South Rutan Avenue, Wichita, Kans.; Charles H. Helsper, 1199 West Street, Topeka, Kans.; Robert W. Salyers, 1801 South Third Street, Louisville, Ky.; F. M. Broussard, Lafayette, La.; Paul Jones, Winfield, La.; Hon. Homer E. Capehart, Capehart Farms, Washington, Ind.; Miss Pauline Pino, 2507 Boulevard, Las Vegas, N. Mex.;

Hon. Charles P. Nelson, Waterville, Maine; Charles LeRoy Haines, 21 Pine Street, Ellsworth, Maine; Miss Dorothy Bigelow, Easton, Maine; Donald Larabee, Gorham, Maine; Mrs. Winifred H. Grant, Wayside, Md.; William R. Clay, 3 Pooks Hill Lane, Bethesda, Md.; Charles F. Sharkey, 31 Thurston Street, Somerville, Mass.; Mrs. Leona K. Knight, Bloomfield Hill, Mich.; Miss Hazel Iremam, 922 South State Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Hon. Ruth Thompson, 816 Division Street, White Hall, Mich.; James A. Davis, 2027 Twentyninth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.; Mrs. Donald Osborne Hays, Flora, Miss.; Paul D. Best, Tunica, Miss.;

Eric G. Jannson, 5738 Walsh Street, St. Louis, Mo.; Clarence McCune, 6425 McGee Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo.; Lawrence Scheewe, 540 Hillsdale Avenue, Helena, Mont.; Miss Molly Clasby, Missoula, Mont.; Miss Jessie Stearns, Lincoln, Nebr.; Walter R. Johnson, Omaha, Nebr.; William F. McMenamin, 1131 Ralston Street, Reno, Nev.; Miss Mildred Latham, 29 East First Street, Reno, Nev.; William J. Fleming, 45 North Stenton Street, Atlantic City, N. J.; Ralph G. Denn, Rio Grande, N. J.; Arthur Angel, 926 South Pacific, Las Vegas, N. Mex.;

Wilfred S. Dowling, 330 West Seventy-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Miss Marie T. Dowling, 1882 DeKalb Avenue, Ridgewood, Brooklyn, N. Y.; John K. Slear, 511 North Church Street, Charlotte, N. C.; Mrs. W. Ney Evans, High Point, N. C.; Peter Vallar, Winston-Salem, N. C.; John S. Bartlett, 458 Moreley Avenue, Akron, Ohio; Carl M. Walker, Pierre, S. Dak.; Miss Iva Van Horn, Kennebec, S. Dak.; William L. Covington, 1510 Gale Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.; D. C. Scott Daniel, Paris, Tenn.; W. M. Burkhalter, McKenzie, Tenn.; Miss Bessie D. Thrasher, 2308 Highland Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.; Maurice R. Barnes, Kaysville, Utah; Don Cassidy, Tooele, Utah; Robert W. Barker, 1217 Washington Boulevard, Ogden, Utah; John Y. Merrell, Brigham City, Utah; Miss Dorothy Hurley, St. Albans, Vt.;

Capt. George P. Grove, 3608 North Albemarle Street, Arlington, Va.; Mrs. Grace Montgomery, 301 Bellview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.; Col. Heber H. Rice, 208 West Eleventh Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.; Willis G. Kemper, 45 Maple Avenue, Morgantown, W. Va.; Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, Beckley, W. Va.; Hon. J. R. Farrington, 3180 Pacific Heights Road, Honolulu, Hawaii; Mrs. Margaret C. Turner, 607 Stangenwald Building, Honolulu, Hawaii; Ray E. Davis, Melbourne, Ark.; George A. Herman, 11 Crocker Road, Medford, Mass.; Kenneth W. Ingwalson, Little Falls, Minn.; J. F. Caprenter, Crookston, Minn.; Earl Cox, 17 Alfareta Avenue, Akron, Ohio; John M. King, 1318 Northwest Ninety-first Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.;

Kenneth N. Hardy, Edmond, Okla.; Keith Hall, 808 North Holman Street, Portland, Oreg.; Miss Pherne Miller, Eugene, Oreg.; Hon. O. E. Teague, Bryan, Tex.; L. Tex Easley,

1106 Wesleyan Avenue, Fort Worth, Tex.; Hon. William K. Van Pelt, 47 Oak Lawn Avenue, Fond du Lac, Wis.; Walter Haefs, Oshkosh, Wis.; H. Mills Astin, 815 East Fifth Street, Casper, Wyo.; Miss Marian Jones, Lingle, Wyo.; Hon. John J. Allen, Jr., Oakland, Calif.; Milo Palmer, Concord, N. H.; Miss Victoria E. Dobroska, 78 Temple Street, Nashua, N. H.; Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, Greenville, S. C.; Rev. J. Warren Hastings, Seattle, Wash.; and other persons who are members of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., their successors, and persons admitted to membership pursuant to the provisions of this act, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the "Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.," and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The purposes of this corporation shall be to promote friendly and cooperative relations between the various State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia, and to foster, participate in, and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic, and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, to act as contact agent with States for carrying out State and National programs.

SEC. 3. The corporation shall have the following powers:

(a) To sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(b) To adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(c) To choose such officers, managers, and agents as the business of the corporation may require;

(d) To ordain and establish bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or of any State in which the corporation operates, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(e) To contract and be contracted with;

(f) To take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law of any State (1) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (2) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(g) To transfer or convey real or personal property;

(h) To borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue notes, bonds, or other evidences of indebtedness therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

(i) To use and display such emblems and badges as it may adopt;

(j) To publish a newspaper, magazine, or other publication consistent with its corporate purposes;

(k) To do any and all acts necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 4. (a) The headquarters and principal offices of the corporation shall be located in Washington, D. C., but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States and Territories of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, such designation to be filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Notice to, or service upon, such agent, or mailed to the address of such

agent, shall be deemed sufficient notice or service upon the corporation.

SEC. 5. The membership of the corporation shall be made up of the members of the various State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this act, be determined according to the regulations and bylaws of the corporation.

SEC. 6. The officers of the corporation shall be a president, first vice president, second vice president, secretary, assistant secretary, treasurer, assistant treasurer, historian, and such other officers as may be designated by the governing body.

SEC. 7. (a) The governing body of the corporation shall be a board of representatives which shall consist of one representative from each State society and Territorial society in the District of Columbia. Such board of representatives shall exercise the powers herein granted to the corporation, and each member of such board shall have one vote upon all matters determined.

(b) The officers shall be elected by such board of representatives at an annual meeting and shall serve for a term of 1 year.

(c) The first board of representatives shall be composed of the following:

Chairman, Charles LeRoy Haines; first vice chairman, Lawrence Scheewe; second vice chairman, Mrs. Esther Costa; secretary, Miss Bessie D. Thrasher; assistant secretary, Miss Dorothy Bigelow; treasurer, Mrs. Charles Henderson; regional directors, William J. Fleming, chairman; region I, Miss Catherine Flynn; region II, William Clay; region III, John Slear; region IV, James A. Davis; region V, Arnold M. Lederer; region VI, Miss Carlotta Reedy; region VII, Claude M. Hirst; region VIII, Maj. Robert Joy; region IX, Col. K. N. Parkison.

Ray E. Davis, Hoyt G. Irving, Mrs. Gertrude J. Scott, John J. Shaforth, Miss Utah Gray Smith, Ernest W. Ellis, Gertrude L. Groman, Mrs. Edna Rose Pearson, Mrs. Donald O. Hays, James H. Pearson, William McMenamin, Wilfred S. Dowling, John S. Bartlett, Mrs. Maurine Howard Abernathy, Carl M. Walker, Don Cassidy, William Garnett Lee, Walter Haefs, Heber H. Rice, Miss Marion Jones, Miss Dorothy Hurley, Charles F. Sharkey, Arthur Angel, Ralph A. Patterson, Miss Hazel Ireman.

SEC. 8. The corporation may acquire any or all of the assets of the existing organization known as the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., upon discharging or providing for the payment and discharge of all its liabilities; and shall promptly file with the Congress full information with respect to such discharge provisions.

SEC. 9. No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure or be distributable to any member or officer thereof except upon dissolution and final liquidation of the corporation as provided in section 17 of this act.

SEC. 10. No part of the activities of the corporation shall consist of carrying on propaganda.

SEC. 11. The corporation, and its members and officers as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

SEC. 12. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep current and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members and of the board of representatives or committees having any authority of the board of representatives. It shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any mem-

ber or his agent or attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 14. The corporation shall not have or issue any shares of stock, nor declare or pay any dividends.

SEC. 15. The corporation shall not make any loans to its officers or members of the board of representatives. Any officer or board of representatives member who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or board of representatives member, and any officer or board of representatives member who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

SEC. 16. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than July 15 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds.

SEC. 17. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after the discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation shall be divided equally among the State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 18. The corporation shall have the exclusive right to use, in carrying out its purposes, the name, "Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.," and such seals, emblems, and badges as it may adopt.

SEC. 19. As a condition precedent to the exercise in any State of any power or privilege granted or conferred by this act, the corporation shall serve notice upon the secretary of state, or similar officer, of any such State of the name and address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom legal process or demands against the corporation may be served.

SEC. 20. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., and its purpose shall be to promote friendly and cooperative relations between the various State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia and to foster, participate in, and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic, and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, and to act as contact agent with States for carrying out State and National programs.

The Corporation would include not only those names enumerated in the bill but would also include other persons who are members of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., their

successors, and persons admitted to membership pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Since the corporation might acquire property located in the District of Columbia, section 20 of the bill was adopted by amendment so that it would be clear that activities in the District of Columbia would be in accordance with law enforced in the District of Columbia.

This legislation would involve no cost to the District or Federal Government and has the approval of many members of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, line 16 add a new section 20. "Sec. 20. As used in this act the word 'State' includes the District of Columbia."

On page 12 renumber "Sec. 20" as "Sec. 21."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING IMPROVEMENTS TO TWO GASOLINE SERVICE STATIONS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5511) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to permit the erection, construction, alteration, conversion, maintenance, and use of such buildings and other improvements on (1) square 2695, lot numbered 800 (east side of Sixteenth Street, between Taylor and Upshur Streets NW.), and (2) square 1928, lot numbered 5 (southeast corner of the intersection of Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenues NW.), both situated in the District of Columbia, as the Commissioners may deem appropriate for the purpose of conducting the businesses which are being conducted on such lands on the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two gasoline service stations located in the vicinity of Massachusetts and Wisconsin Avenues.

Under existing law the owners have the right to continue to operate the business which they have operated for approximately 30 years. However, because of the zoning law it is impossible for them to make improvements to the building in which they do business. If this bill were enacted into law, the owners of these buildings would be able to replace the buildings which they now occupy with modern, up-to-date structures in keeping with other buildings in the neighborhood. These improvements would also bring additional revenue into the

District of Columbia in the form of real-estate tax.

The bill would involve no cost to the Federal or District Government.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: Page 1, line 8, after the word "numbered", strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET K. N. MILLER

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3376) for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$12,500" and insert "\$10,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER STUDY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the old-age retirement and survivors benefits provided under the Railroad Retirement Act, with a view to ascertaining what changes should be made in such act. The committee shall determine the scope of such study and investigation and, without limitation thereon, the following shall be given consideration:

(1) The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

(2) The existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system.

(3) The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

(4) Any changes that should be made in the existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to simplifying administration, eliminating inequities and anomalies as regards benefits to workers whose earnings are included in whole or in part under either system, and strengthening the financial base for benefits to be provided under one system without impairing the financial base underlying benefits provided under the other system.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the ses-

sions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The committee is authorized to designate and appoint an advisory council, as described in section 4, to study, assist, consult with, and advise the committee, or its duly authorized subcommittee, and the committee is further authorized to designate and appoint such other officers, experts, or assistants as it deems necessary for the performance of the investigation directed by this resolution.

SEC. 4. The membership of the Advisory Council shall be as follows: (1) Two persons appointed from recommendations made by representatives of employees subject to the Railroad Retirement Act; (2) two persons appointed from recommendations made by representatives of carrier employers subject to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act; (3) one representative of the Railroad Retirement Board; (4) one representative of the Social Security Administration of the Federal Security Agency; (5) five persons not employees within the meaning of the Railroad Retirement Act and not employees of an employer subject to such act who possess special knowledge and experience regarding the Railroad Retirement Act, the Social Security Act, or employee-benefit plans generally.

SEC. 5. The compensation of persons assisting the committee in the study and investigation directed by this resolution shall be fixed by the committee at such amounts or rates as the committee deems appropriate, but such amounts or rates shall not exceed the amounts or rates payable for comparable duties prescribed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

SEC. 6. The committee, or its duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in the performance of its duties under this resolution.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

SEC. 8. The committee shall render its full report and recommendations to the Congress not later than February 15, 1952.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee on railroad retirement legislation, hereinafter called the "joint committee," to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee, and three members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee, and it is hereby authorized and directed, to make a full and complete fact-finding study and investigation of the Railroad Retirement Act, and of such related problems as it may deem proper, with a view toward ascertaining what changes should be made in such act. The joint committee shall determine the scope of such study and investigation, without limitation thereon, and the following shall be given consideration:

1. The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

2. The existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system.

3. The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

4. Any changes that should be made in the existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to simplifying administration, eliminating inequities and anomalies as regards benefits to workers whose earnings are included in whole or in part under either system, and strengthening the financial base for benefits to be provided under one system without impairing the financial base underlying benefits provided under the other system.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Then we will consider the House resolution, which is a privileged matter.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I consider this resolution a very constructive approach to the problems that are involved in the matter of improving benefits to retired railroad workers and their survivors. It is the sensible way to approach this matter. It should have the approval of everyone, because it will enable a full and complete review and study of all the questions that pertain to the welfare of our retired railroad workers and their survivors. It will undoubtedly result in helpful recommendations for the improvement of the Railroad Retirement Act, by finding ways and means of increasing benefits without additional taxes and maintaining the stability of the retirement fund.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 1, line 9, after "the", strike out "chairman of that committee" and insert "Speaker."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a companion resolution as the result of the action of the House yesterday amending the Railroad Retirement Act. You will recall that those of us who engaged in the debate said that it would be necessary to have a continuing study in order to resolve some of the differences that have been apparent and factual for a long period of time. Such resolution was adopted in the other body, Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, which has been, without objection, substituted for the House resolution reported by the Committee on Rules, providing for the study.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. What amendment did the gentleman offer a few minutes ago?

Mr. HARRIS. I offered an amendment, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution providing for the appointment of the House members of this joint committee to be made by the Speaker. That is, as I understand, the regular established procedure and language with reference to the appointment of committees under special resolutions.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In other words, to have done otherwise would have set an unprecedented act on the part of this House encroaching upon the prerogatives of the Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. That is my understanding, and that was the amendment which was agreed to when the resolution was called up. There is no question about the necessity of this approach to the problem. It is recognized in this body and in the other body. It was so acknowledged by the gentlemen on the other end of the Capitol at the time the bill was considered. This resolution was passed over there immediately after they considered and passed the retirement bill, that is, matters relating to the Railroad Retirement Act. They concurred in this in order that the joint committee may take up these problems and endeavor to resolve them as we assured you we would undertake.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When will this committee report back to the House?

Mr. HARRIS. That I could not say. This resolution does not have a specific date. The resolution which was reported by the Committee on Rules required a report be made by February 15, I believe, but every effort will be made to make the report as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to highly commend the gentleman for sponsoring this resolution. I think there are certain areas of inequities that should be straightened out, and I am satisfied that the committee intends to do something about it. I highly commend the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. I know the specific problem he has in mind and which he presented to the House yesterday. As I said then, it can and perhaps will be taken up and considered in connection with this investigation and study.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. As I recall, the Senate resolution does not require specifically that an investigation or changes should be made in "the character and amount of present benefits" to be provided, and particularly this language "and the estimated cost of providing such benefits." Am I correct?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is reading from the House resolution?

Mr. HESELTON. Yes, the Senate resolution eliminated the language "and the estimated cost of providing such benefits."

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is included in this resolution. It is in different language, of course, but this provides a broad, general investigation without limitation into the entire matter of railroad retirement; not only railroad retirement, but its relationship with social security and only to that extent with social security.

Mr. HESELTON. Having in mind the debate yesterday, I simply wanted the author of the resolution to assure not only those of us who spoke yesterday but the entire Membership of the House that there would be a definite study made of the estimated cost of the benefits included in the bill we passed yesterday.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman may have the assurance. This concurrent resolution on page 2, in the category of points to be given consideration, provides:

1. The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

So it would be included.

Mr. HESELTON. That is to say that the cost of present benefits would be included, but what I am interested in is, what will be the cost of the benefits in the bill we passed yesterday? I think that subject matter should be definitely

a part of this study. I hope the gentleman feels the same way.

Mr. HARRIS. Paragraph 3 in the concurrent resolution reads:

The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

So it takes care of the present benefits and those to be paid in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the concurrent resolution be adopted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to express to the Members entire accord with the resolution that is now before the House. I believe it will prove most beneficial in promoting the welfare of retired railroad workers and their survivors.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I can say to the House that it is my information that this concurrent resolution for the joint study meets with the favor of those who are interested in the railroad retirement program. They have stated very definitely that they would prefer the joint study rather than have it made by either of the bodies.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true. It is also in accord, I believe, with the views expressed in the reports that were submitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with the proposed railroad retirement legislation by the Bureau of the Budget and the Social Security Administration. It is along lines that all those who are thinking in terms of the welfare of the railroad employees can support.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I imagine this committee will make every effort to get the report back to the next session of Congress so that we may take action on their recommendations.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who for many years has worked zealously in the interest of railroad workers and their families, that such is our desire and it is our intention and purpose to do so.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE MODERN AMERICAN WAY

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, within the past few years the American people have lost, in a large degree, sight of the true values, in that they have come to think more in terms of how much money or other material things a man has than of how much individual freedom he has. There was a time in this country when a liberal was defined as a man who stood for those things that would result in the maximum of individual human liberty with a minimum of governmental control. Times have changed, however, until we now find that a man is classified as liberal in his thinking in direct proportion to his willingness to legally take from one citizen and give to another; or, as to how liberal he is in the spending of other people's money.

According to the definition of liberalism that was extant in the day of those men who were the architects of our freedom, such as Jefferson, Washington, and Jackson, I am one of the most liberal Members of this Congress. By the same token, according to the modern definition, I am one of the most conservative Members of this body.

As to political realities, I am a good Democrat so long as you will allow me to define the term. Judged by the definition prescribed by the modern ultra-liberal, ADA, CIO-PAC, socialistic, dogooding, New Deal, Fair Deal, internationalist, boondoggling, befuddled theistic intellectual coalition that calls itself the Democratic Party, I am not a good Democrat. By my own definition, however, which I think is as good as any other and is in line with Jefferson's theory of the "least governed being the best governed people," I am one of the best Democrats alive today.

There are those who will and have said that if I am not a good Democrat according to the modern definition then I must be some sort of geographically misplaced Republican. Here again I must disagree, for if all the modern Republican Party can offer is that which it is now offering in the way of either a retrogressive policy of going back to the so-called good old days which denies progress of any kind or a policy of weak-kneed, namby-pamby, gutless, fearful, jellyfish type of me-tooism—attempting always to out-deal the New and Fair Dealers—pushing and shoving for position of favor in the eyes of arrogant and selfish pressure groups, then I am not a Republican by any stretch of the imagination.

The modern Republican Party is like a rose in one respect only and that is in that it smells the same though called by another name. In its last bid for the election of a President, those who spoke for the GOP said that they agreed in all major substance with the policies of the incumbent party; with the incumbent party's domestic policy and its foreign policy or lack of policy, and with any other quack or nostrum they thought would garner a few misguided votes into its column. They said, in effect, that they agreed with the arrangement of the furniture but promised to do a little neater job of housekeeping. Feeling that they almost had to present at least one

solid issue, they did say that the Taft-Hartley law should not be repealed and then proceeded to take the substance from their position by agreeing to amend the law in such a way as to suit the selfish whims of politically powerful labor leaders.

No, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of an honest alternative that will be alternative in more than name alone, I shall cling tenaciously to the political beliefs and teachings of those, like Jefferson, who founded the real Democratic Party. If renegade Johnny-come-latelies happen to currently control the machinery of the party of my fathers, and though fate should mistakenly decree that they should continue in control for uncertain season, I choose to maintain my beleaguered position in the fond hope that a brighter day may soon dawn when the leadership of my party shall return to the ancient landmarks of individual liberty and freedom under God. In the absence of this prospective return by my own party, no real alternative is offered by the current minority party.

An example of synonymous policy concurrently espoused by both the major political parties occupying the contemporary American scene is found in the fact that both invariably attempt to solve every problem that arises by the apparently simple expedient of appropriating a few billion dollars of uncollected tax money out of the pockets of the American people. They are both seemingly coldly materialistic in their evident belief that all the problems that beset mankind can be solved by spending a few more billions of magic things called dollars.

In their mad scramble to entice voters to the polls each political party had attempted to out-do the other in promising the American people more and more of less and less. In answer to this materialistic bid for their suffrage, the American people have failed to realize that these promises of more and more of the Utopian something-for-nothing mirages can result in nothing more than less and less of the things of real and lasting value. They have used the instrument of suffrage to mortgage their birthright of freedom to a bunch of political opportunists in exchange for a will-of-the-wisp mess of pottage called security.

The modern political sirens have strung their materialistic harps with honeyed phrases; tuned them to the throbbing selfishness of little men; and, like Circe of old, enticed the Ulysses of human liberty dangerously close to the rocks of ruin. We, who as watchers in the night from off a distant shore, despair of hope to see those who would rise in fearless strength to pour the wax of truth into the ears of our great Ulysses and bind him to the mast from which the flag of freedom flies.

Expediency born of crisis after crisis is the current order of the day. Like Roman emperors of a bygone day who, when grain from public warehouses filled empty stomachs but failed to answer questions of the human heart, would seek to divert attention to the expediency of some foreign military crisis, our so-called

leaders operate in this modern day. In all our highly vaunted twentieth century wisdom we still appear sufficiently glib as to swallow this nostrum of a by-gone age and swallow it willingly so long as the witch doctors promise to keep our pockets filled with inflated dollars. God give us wisdom soon to see that dollars cannot buy for us either friends or freedom.

In our latest and current adventure into foreign military crisis we have wasted over 100,000 casualties in a Korean war that seemingly has no clearly defined objective. American boys, who to their loved ones are more than serial numbers upon a printed page, have struggled through the heat and cold; been buffeted from one uncounted heart-break hill to another slaughterpen peak; suffered loneliness that only a soldier's heart can know; felt the warm and precious dreams of home and fireside freeze into the marrow of his bones to be buried in some unmarked grave upon a hostile shore; felt the hot tide of his own life's blood well into his throat in such way as to drown into feeble and unanswered whisper his burning question as to why he was made to give his all to no real purpose. May those who have had their part in placing those precious lives as sacrifice on the altar of their insatiable political ego pray this day that the dying breath of those who give their all may form the words first spoken by Him who died for all: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

As if the sin of sending men to die on foreign fields to no real purpose were not enough to rend the heart with endless shame, we compound our utter calumny by allowing, yes, even encouraging, men here within the safety and comfort of the homeland to strike for trivial and incidental excuse, thereby withholding from those who bear our standard in the field the very things they must require in the way of weapons and materials of war. Not only do we allow and encourage official strikes within vital defense projects but we allow and encourage men to loaf and make time so that more inflated dollars may be paid to them. Shame on those who loaf and racketeer and greater shame on those in authority who allow and encourage it. They will not be held guiltless of the blood that now drenches the gullies surrounding the heartbreak hills of Korea.

If those befuddled intellectuals who sit within the paneled halls at Lake Success could be brought preemptorily down from their stratospheric realm of fantasy and placed physically upon the field of battle in Korea, they would soon learn that battles cannot be won within the ether of intellectual dogma. If their smug and high-sounding phrases could be changed, just for 1 day, to the soundless screams of panic caused by the impending plunge of a bayonet's cold steel that paralyzes vocal cords and freezes blood within the veins, then practical means of ending this senseless slaughter would occupy their thinking. At least, they would find some way of stopping our own so-called allies from

furnishing the enemy with the very bayonets that kill our men.

We, as a nation, have tried all the materialistic nostrums that could possibly be dreamed up by a bunch of befuddled intellectuals who have been directing our destiny for the past few years. All of these have been of worse than no avail for they have left us worse than they found us. In desperation, if for no other reason, it is high time that we return to constitutional government in this country so that we can live in a land governed by law instead of being governed by men. If we do not soon return to the concepts upon which this country was founded, it will not be long before our freedom will be forfeited by being hanged, like Judas of old, upon our national cross of lethargy and liberty under God will lie forever buried in a potter's field of shame.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when the international conference was held recently at San Francisco for the signing of a peace treaty with Japan, the Japanese Diet, which is the equivalent of our Congress, sent to the conference a delegation of its members representing the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of Japan and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the upper body, which is called the House of Councillors. Formerly in the days of the old empire, it was called the House of Lords and membership in it was by birth. Now the members of the upper body as well as of the lower body are elected by popular vote.

After attending the San Francisco conference, these gentlemen came on to Washington to observe and study our political processes. They were received by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, through the kindness of the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and attended some of our hearings.

Our guests are citizens and legislators of a country which only so recently was an enemy of the United States. It has broken with its militaristic past to a remarkable degree. These are among the men in Japan who have been waging a valiant battle down through the years, and now successful, to turn their country's course into the paths of peace and world cooperation and democratic government. They were so impressed and pleased by their reception here that they asked me if they could send a message of greetings to the Congress. I told them, Mr. Speaker, that if they would prepare a statement I would be happy indeed to present and read it to the Congress. The message signed by the four members of the Diet is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As representatives of the Foreign Affairs Committees of the Japanese Diet now visiting the United States, we are greatly honored at having been granted the privilege of conveying a message of greetings to the Congress of the United States.

We were extremely fortunate in having been able to attend the San Francisco con-

ference at which the Japanese Peace Treaty was signed. This event marked the beginning of an era during which Japan will be able to take her place among the free nations of the world and cooperate in establishing and maintaining a true peace.

In the name of the people of Japan we wish to express our gratitude to the United States for the good will and understanding you have shown in the reconstruction of Japan. It is our most earnest wish that the United States and Japan will continue to work together in a spirit of mutual trust and respect, in order to achieve the sort of world in which all people can enjoy the benefits and privileges of true freedom.

SEIICHI OHMURA,
Chief of Delegation.
MORIO SASAKI,
House of Representatives.
UNJURO MUTO,
House of Representatives.
INO DAN,
House of Councillors.
TOSHITO SATOW,
Chief of Staff, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

THE PROPOSED ALUMINUM INDUSTRY FOR MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress a letter I have just received from the Honorable R. D. Searles, Under Secretary of the Interior, about the proposed loan to the Harvey Co. to establish an aluminum industry in the Flathead Valley of Montana.

I have received replies to my letters from the Attorney General of the United States and RFC Administrator Stuart Symington. This letter from Mr. Searles is in reply to my letter to Secretary Chapman asking for an explanation of charges made against the Harvey Co. My request to the Hardy investigating committee for an investigation of this matter has been granted and I am hopeful that it will issue its report shortly.

I have also introduced a bill in the House to establish a clearinghouse in the Department of Justice for the purpose of screening all companies seeking to do business with the Government. I have requested the gentleman from New York, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings on my proposal at the earliest opportunity and he has promised to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am turning this material over to the Hardy committee for its consideration during the course of its investigation.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, October 17, 1951.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re Harvey Machine Co.

MY DEAR MIKE: This will supplement the information given to you over the phone in answer to your letter of September 17. Since I handled the negotiations on the proposed loan to the Harvey Machine Co.

of Montana, I am writing a detailed answer to your letter. As we mentioned to you on the phone, we desired to make a thorough investigation of the questions which you presented to us before sending an answer to you.

We have conferred with both the Department of Justice and the Department of the Navy regarding their past experience with the Harvey Machine Co. and its personnel.

We held a conference in this Department with Mr. Symington of the RFC, Mr. Jess Larson of the GSA, Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the DPA, Assistant Attorney General McInerney, and Mr. E. E. Wilcox of Secretary of the Navy Kimball's office. At this meeting all of the information which we have regarding the above company was given to those present.

In addition to the conference, we have furnished Mr. Fleischmann with copies of letters regarding this company which we have received from the Department of Justice and from the Department of the Navy. All of our findings have now been given to Mr. Fleischmann and we expect that a final determination on this loan will be made by him in the very near future.

In the conference of July 31 to which you refer, you were given in detail the basis on which we proposed to recommend to DPA the loan to the Harvey Machine Co. The final proposal as made by the Defense Minerals Administration to DPA was the same as that discussed at the above conference except for several additional restrictions favorable to the Government. In turn, when DPA considered our recommendation they added several additional considerations and restrictions.

As you will recall, the Harvey Machine Co. in the spring of 1950, prior to Korea, showed their first interest in building an aluminum reduction plant in Montana. At that time they conferred with the Bonneville Power Administration on the purchase of power from Hungry Horse Dam for a two pot-line reduction plant. In subsequent months, after the Korean fighting started, it was quite evident that a large increase in aluminum capacity would be needed and this company undertook to expand their plans to three or four pot lines at the Kalispell location.

In December of 1950 they were certified by DMA for an allocation for the production of 72,000 tons of aluminum and negotiated with GSA for a procurement contract.

After several months the company informed us that they were unsuccessful in obtaining the private financing with which they had anticipated building the plant. On May 31 they filed with us an application for a loan of \$70,274,831 for construction of a four pot-line plant at Kalispell, together with an aluminum plant to be located near Tacoma, Wash.

On June 14 we informed the Harvey Co. that it would be impossible to consider the loan on the basis of the equity capital which they proposed to put into the new company but that consideration might be given for a loan to build a three pot-line plant.

On June 15 the Harvey Machine Co. informed us that they desired to modify their application and reduce the amount of the loan to \$50,000,000 for construction of a three pot-line plant. They proposed that they would pay into a new company \$6,000,000 which would be obtained in exchange for stock in a new corporation.

On July 10 Dr. James Boyd, then Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration, made the following recommendation to the secretary:

"The recommendation for a Government loan to Harvey Machine Co. for three pot lines (54,000 tons) and an alumina plant, but not for their own bauxite facilities, in

the amount of approximately \$45,000,000 contingent on their being able to complete these facilities with this amount and the proposed \$6,000,000 plus in cash equity; together with a tax amortization certificate which RFC requests that be granted with their DPA loans. I believe we have delayed a decision in this case too long, changing our minds so frequently that we are duty bound to give them the chance to finish up their deal, as they are already far advanced and a new company coming in at scratch will delay the program further."

Dr. Boyd also made this recommendation in his letter of July 16 addressed to Mr. E. T. Gibson, then Acting Administrator of DPA.

After several further conferences, the Harvey people advised us that they were unable to obtain the \$6,000,000 which they had expected would be forthcoming from New York financial interests. On August 1 they made the following proposal:

"A new company, Harvey Machine Co., Inc., of Montana, requests a loan of \$46,000,000 required to construct an integrated aluminum project.

"Harvey Machine Co., Inc. (a California corporation) proposes to furnish \$3,500,000 equity capital through the contribution of cash, equipment, and land to the new company. An additional \$3,500,000 cash is to be paid into the new company by the sale to purchasers, including such independent fabricators as desire to invest money to get an assured supply of aluminum, of company securities junior to the requested loan of a type or types satisfactory to the fiscal agent."

After further discussions, we recommended to DPA a loan of \$46,000,000 to the above company for the construction of a three pot-line reduction plant of 54,000 tons capacity, an alumina facility of 108,000 tons annual capacity, and for the purchase of ore boats. We sent DPA our recommendation on August 6, as follows:

"The company proposes a capitalization of \$7,000,000 of which \$3,500,000 will be paid in by contribution of cash, land, and equipment by the Harvey Machine Co., of California. This contribution is to be made prior to the date of the loan.

"The other \$3,500,000 is to be supplied through the sale of stock to be offered to the public and especially to independent fabricators. The Harvey Machine Co., of California, is to guarantee the sale of the additional stock and is given a limit of 18 months in which to pay in this additional \$3,500,000. A copy of the California company's financial statement and Dun & Bradstreet's report are attached.

"In case the company fails to obtain the additional contribution of \$3,500,000, the Government is to have the option of selling the complete facilities to another operator, for which the Harvey Machine Co. would be reimbursed for the cost of the construction of the plant, the cost to be determined by the Government.

"A list of conditions and requirements of the loan is attached. This list is subject to any additional requirements that the fiscal agent (the RFC) may desire. There may be additional information that your office will want. If so, please contact Mr. Shooshan in my office, or Mr. H. Heckmann, of the Defense Minerals Administration."

The staff of the DPA discussed the loan with the Harvey Co. for approximately 10 days and added several conditions. One added condition required Mr. Leo Harvey, Sr., to put up a bond of \$1,000,000 to guarantee that the \$3,500,000 of additional money would be paid in within 18 months, the \$1,000,000 to be forfeited if the additional cash had not been contributed. If the Harvey Co. does not pay in the additional \$3,500,000 within 18 months the Government, in addition to taking the \$1,000,000 as a for-

feiture, has the option of selling the complete facilities to another operator. The sale price would be based on the cost of the construction of the plant, the cost to be determined by the Government.

The Government loan has the following further protection. Condition 6 (a) of the loan was as follows:

"Disbursements of the loan proceeds to be made from time to time in such amounts and in such manner as fiscal agent may decide, provided that prior to each disbursement fiscal agent is in receipt of satisfactory evidence that the amount then to be disbursed is necessary and the construction for which payment is to be made is in accordance with the plans, specifications, cost estimate, and construction contract filed with the fiscal agent pursuant to condition 7 (c) hereunder."

Thus, the plant was to be constructed under the supervision and control of the Government so that there was to be complete knowledge of the cost and assurance of satisfactory design and construction.

Certain other conditions which protect the Government are as follows.

"Management agreement—This will be an agreement executed by borrower, providing that until payment in full of the indebtedness evidenced by the note, the management of borrower will be satisfactory to Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the delegate agency and if within 30 days from the date of forwarding by RFC of notice to the borrower that borrower's management is not satisfactory and borrower does not make changes so that its management shall be satisfactory then the RFC with the concurrence of the delegate agency may at any time thereafter, without notice to borrower, accelerate the maturity of the indebtedness evidenced by the note.

"Agreement that if the applicant company remains wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (A) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, (B) all tax savings accruing to the parent company through consolidation of its earnings with the subsidiary, (C) all earned accelerated amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, (D) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes of the parent company as if there were no consolidation (it is understood that net income for this purpose shall be computed after amortization and depreciation of the parent company).

"An agreement as an alternative to (1) above that if the subsidiary company is not wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, and is therefore not consolidated with the parent company for tax purposes, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (A) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, plus (B) all earned amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, plus (C) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes."

Recommendation to DPA was based on the determination that the Harvey Machine Co. was in a position to construct this plant in as short or shorter time than any other company that was interested or available to build the plant. After they were allocated aluminum production in December 1950, this company placed orders for some \$20,000,000 of equipment for the plant, which equipment is under construction at the present time. This added greatly to their ability to be an earlier producer.

At the time the proposed loan was recommended all of the companies producing

aluminum had just been granted a second phase of expansion. The first and second phases are as follows:

| Name | Location | Tonnage | Estimated cost |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Alcoa..... | Washington. | 85,000 | \$60,000,000 |
| Do..... | Texas..... | ¹ 85,000 | 115,000,000 |
| Do..... | do..... | 35,000 | 34,000,000 |
| Kaiser..... | Louisiana..... | ¹ 100,000 | 70,000,000 |
| Do..... | do..... | ¹ 100,000 | 75,000,000 |
| Do..... | Washington..... | ² 20,000 | 12,800,000 |
| Reynolds..... | Texas..... | ¹ 75,000 | 79,700,000 |
| Do..... | Arkansas..... | 23,000 | 14,300,000 |
| Do..... | Oregon..... | 2,000 | 475,000 |
| Do..... | Washington..... | ² 20,000 | 10,000,000 |
| Total..... | | 545,000 | 471,275,000 |

¹ Includes power plant.

² Production rate: Actual capacity 27,500 tons.

³ Production rate: Actual capacity 24,000 tons.

NOTE.—Alumina facilities not included.

Your attention is invited to the fact that 481,000 tons of the total tonnage (545,000 tons) was located in the South and Southwest, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

The Reynolds Co. had been given all of the additional expansion that they desired to take at that time. In order to handle the financing of the last 20,000 tons GSA had found it necessary to agree to make them an advance payment of \$9,000,000 to be paid back in aluminum after this plant expansion was in production. As you will readily see, the engineering forces of these three companies were all well-occupied, as were their administrative departments, with the vast expansion which they had on hand.

The Harvey Machine Co. had developed their plans for the Kalispell plant over a period of the last 8 months, and it appeared evident that they would be able to give the earliest production of aluminum over anyone to whom we could give this allocation.

Under the conditions of the loan, the \$7,000,000, of which \$3,500,000 was to be advanced originally by the Harvey interests and \$3,500,000 paid in from additional stock, was to be credited against the \$46,000,000 and act as repayment on the loan. Provided the plant was built for the \$46,000,000 estimated, the total loan made by the Government would be \$39,000,000. Because of the difficulty today to determine exactly the final cost of the plant, which requires 18 months for construction, the \$46,000,000 plus the \$7,000,000 of equity capital, or a total of \$53,000,000, was to be available for the plant. This meant that equity capital of 15 percent or more of the loan was being furnished by the borrowers.

As you know, the power to be used by the Harvey Aluminum Co. at Kalispell, Mont., does not come on the line for at least another year on completion of Hungry Horse Dam and filling of the reservoir. Regardless of statements to the contrary, it had no effects whatsoever on the current shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest. It is my understanding that this power has been allocated to the State of Montana by law and even if it were available at the present time, which it is not, its use would be restricted to Montana.

The Department has assumed that an applicant who makes a request from our defense agencies here, and who is currently enjoying a contract with any of the agencies of the Department of Defense, has been cleared as to ability, integrity, and loyalty. It would be an unnecessary duplication for the defense agencies to make a check if the Department of Defense has already made such a check and has contracted with the individuals for production of needed military goods. In addition, the sources of information in many cases would not be available to us.

Considering the country's urgent need for the production of aluminum, I still feel that this is a satisfactory financial risk for the Government. The terms and conditions are

certainly as tight as they could possibly be and the Government's interests are surely well-protected.

I feel that the staff of DPA did an excellent job in drawing up the final conditions. The question which was later raised as to the past operating experience of the company with the Department of Defense is, of course, a matter on which DPA will make their own decision.

It should be noted that Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser all have contracts requiring the Government to purchase their aluminum capacity for a period of up to 5 years. This is a very important advantage for these companies and it is not an advantage that either DMA or DPA recommended or offered to the Harvey Machine Co.

In conclusion, as I mentioned earlier in this letter, we have furnished Mr. Fleischmann with all of the available information we have concerning the past operations of this company so that he may make his determination as to whether or not the loan proposal will be completed. For your information we are enclosing copies of the loan conditions and I feel sure that after studying them you will agree that they very well protect the interests of the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

R. D. SEARLES,
Under Secretary.

HARVEY MACHINE CO. OF MONTANA, KALISPELL, MONT.—CONDITIONS OF DMA RECOMMENDATION OF LOAN TO DPA

1. Notes will be payable in equal quarterly installments beginning 1 year after completion of the new facilities. Interest at 4½ percent per annum will begin after date of the note. Final maturity 20 years. Fifty percent net earnings clause to be attached.
2. Collateral: A first mortgage will be given to cover all realty and machinery and equipment now owned and subsequently acquired.
3. Proceeds of the loan will be used only for construction of the plant, purchase of equipment and installation of the facilities which will be identified and listed.
4. No dividends will be paid by the company until the loan is repaid.
5. Salary restriction, management, tax deposit and after acquired property agreements are to be made.
6. An agreement that any additional capital must be approved by the fiscal agent.
7. Plans and specifications are to be approved by a delegated agency.
8. Borrower will submit evidence of adequate working capital which has been estimated at \$2,000,000.
9. On request for disbursement of the loan to the borrower, evidence of compliance with all of the above must be shown.
10. Disbursement of the loan will be made only on receipt of prior approval of the fiscal agent or his representative as construction progresses.
11. Preparation of these papers and all details concerning the loan will be subject to the approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as fiscal agent.
12. Any tax saving resulting from a certificate of necessity will be applied on the loan in inverse order of maturity.

HARVEY MACHINE CO., INC., OF MONTANA, KALISPELL, MONT.—DPA CONDITIONS ON LOAN

Terms: To mature 20 years from date of note. Note will be payable in equal quarterly installments beginning 1 year after completion of new facilities. Interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum payable monthly commencing 30 days from date of note.

Collateral: First lien on all land, buildings, building installations, machinery, equipment, furniture, and fixtures now

owned or hereafter acquired by Harvey Machine Co., Inc., of Montana.

Disbursements:

Disbursements of the loan proceeds to be made from time to time in such amounts and in such manner as fiscal agency may decide provided that prior to each disbursement fiscal agent is in receipt of satisfactory evidence that the amount then to be disbursed is necessary and the construction for which payment is to be made is in accordance with the plans, specifications, cost estimate, and construction contract filed with the fiscal agent pursuant to condition 7 (G) hereunder.

The initial disbursement under this authorization may not be made later than 4 months from date of authorization unless this time limit is extended by fiscal agent provided that a time limit for the final disbursement hereunder may be stipulated upon receipt and approval of fiscal agent of the construction program and copy of construction contracts.

Other terms and conditions:

A. No dividends will be paid by the company until loan is repaid.

B. RFC loan agreement.

C. Agreement that no advance to or investments in associated companies be made without prior written approval by fiscal agent.

D. Management agreement: This will be an agreement executed by borrower, providing that until payment in full of the indebtedness evidenced by the note, the management of borrower will be satisfactory to Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the delegate agency and if within 30 days from the date of forwarding by RFC of notice to the borrower that borrower's management is not satisfactory and borrower does not make changes so that its management shall be satisfactory then the RFC with the concurrence of the delegate agency may at any time thereafter, without notice to borrower, accelerate the maturity of the indebtedness evidenced by the note.

E. After acquired property clause.

F. Tax deposit agreement.

G. No disbursement hereunder to be made until approval by fiscal agent of plans, specifications, cost estimates, and copy of construction contracts covering the proposed construction.

H. Working capital to be supplied by applicant. Evidence satisfactory to fiscal agent that not less than \$2,000,000 will be available for working capital upon completion of the facilities.

I. The applicant agrees to provide within 18 months of the date of the loan an additional \$3,500,000 by the sale of equity or junior debt securities. These funds will be applied as determined by the fiscal agent to the reduction of the loan or to defray construction costs in excess of the estimated plant costs or in excess of the amount of the loan and the original capital contribution of the parent company, Harvey Machine Co., Inc., of California.

J. Applicant agrees to furnish a \$1,000,000 personal performance bond to be signed by Leo Harvey, Sr., to guarantee the above. The bond is to be forfeited by failure of the applicant to perform any of the conditions of the above item.

K. In addition to actual cash expenditures made by or for the account of the applicant up to the date of this certificate, as contained in Loan Application DMA 1919, as amended August 2, 1951, and properly chargeable to this project as determined by the fiscal agent, an additional amount in cash shall be deposited with the fiscal agent sufficient to provide a total cash investment by the applicant of not less than \$2,500,000 prior to any disbursement of the loan. Such \$2,500,000 is in addition to the working capi-

tal referred to in paragraph (H) and the \$3,500,000 referred to in paragraph (I).

L. Agreement that if the applicant company remains wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (a) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, (b) all tax savings accruing to the parent company through consolidation of its earnings with the subsidiary, (c) all earned accelerated amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, (d) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes, and (e) one-half of the net income after taxes of the parent company as if there were no consolidation (it is understood that net income for this purpose shall be computed after amortization and depreciation of the parent company).

M. An agreement as an alternate to (L) above that if the subsidiary company is not wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, and is therefore not consolidated with the parent company for tax purposes, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (a) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, plus (b) all earned amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, plus (c) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes.

N. The minimum repayment in any one year is to be one-twentieth of the loan, provided that if any year earned depreciation and amortization plus earnings after taxes are less than this minimum payment, the excess of the cumulative total of repayments made in previous years over the cumulative total of minimum payments due may be applied to this difference.

O. Standby agreement in respect to any debts owed officers or stockholders.

P. Borrower will carry on property insurance of such type and in such amounts as may be required by fiscal agent.

Q. Applicant to agree to furnish fiscal agent monthly income statements as well as quarterly balance sheets not later than 30 days after the close of each quarter until repayment of loan. The income and balance sheet statements shall be in form satisfactory to fiscal agent and sworn to by borrower.

R. The new company shall grant an option in writing enabling the mortgagee to sell the complete project to another producer upon the reimbursement by the Government of the new company for the actual cost to the company exclusive of the cost of the bond referred to in paragraph (J) and without any consideration of the proceeds received by the Government under such bond, all costs to be determined by the Government according to standard accounting procedures; the option to provide that it may be exercised by written notice to the new company 18 months after the date of the loan, if the full \$3,500,000 additional capital has not been paid into the new company at the date of such notice, provided that the time within which such notice may be served may be extended and reextended by mutual consent.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the action of the House of Representatives yesterday in rejecting the conference report on the tax bill was an exercise of sound judgment, and it will have a very salutary effect in the future when the House of Representatives considers tax measures.

It is my honest hope, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees may be able to get together and agree on changes which will make the bill acceptable to this body. In my opinion, as a minimum, I think the conferees should, in the first place, equalize the increase in the personal income tax between the lower-income brackets and the upper-income brackets. The rates should be increased more on those having higher incomes than the present measure calls for.

In the second place, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that the so-called Jenner amendment be deleted from the measure. It is a matter on which the Committee on Ways and Means had previously scheduled hearings. It is a subject on which legislation and regulations have been in existence for 12 years. The conference report makes really a radical change, and there is violent objection on the part of many Members to that provision.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are withholding from every wage earner a certain percentage of his wages to help pay his tax burden. This bill should provide for the same withholding on the coupon clippers, that is, on dividends and interest paid. Because of the lack of a withholding provision the Treasury is losing an estimated \$200,000,000 yearly in evasion of taxes. I think that is a very important provision.

The conference report contained many provisions of relief to those who under present law would necessarily pay an excess-profits tax. In my opinion this is such an important phase of taxation that before any changes are made public hearings should be held and full committee consideration should be given by the Ways and Means Committee.

The House bill provided for the same proportionate rate of increase in the capital-gains tax as it generally provided for individual incomes. This the conference report struck out so that individuals—mostly speculators in stock and commodities—able to take advantage of the capital-gains rate, would share no extra expense for the defense effort.

There are several other important changes from the House bill which could also profitably be modified.

It is my sincere hope that we will yet be able to come into agreement and pass an equitable measure.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 426 was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House

today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THOMAS LOGAN

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 452) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Thomas Logan, son of James Logan, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said James Logan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 437) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 436, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATIONERY ROOM

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 468) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amount as may be necessary to make up any deficit or shortage heretofore incurred in connection with the operation of the stationery room of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make a short report on the report of Secretary General Trygve Lie, of the United Nations. The text of the report appears in the New York Times of Friday, October 12, 1951. I ask unanimous consent to extend this report at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS TRYGVE LIE SHOULD RESIGN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary General of the United Nations Trygve Lie should resign. The basis for that demand is his recent annual report. To read it is to reach but one conclusion, that he does not speak for the free nations of the world who are members of the United Nations; he clearly speaks for socialistic and communistic totalitarianism.

The text of this report was published in the New York Times on Friday, October 12.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be sensational, but I am convinced that the report is dishonest; it is biased; and finally it is an unholy report and an insult to the intelligence of every American.

The report is dishonest because it fails to recognize realities, it ignores world conditions, and by its omissions it attempts to create false impressions and conclusions.

It is biased because it is studiously written to avoid Communist criticism, and much of its language is the everyday jargon of Red propaganda.

It is unholy because the report, in its observations, recommendations, and conclusions, like the United Nations organization, fails to recognize or take into consideration the existence of a Supreme Being.

The report, like all socialistic and communistic doctrines, stresses only the materialistic things in the world, and ignores the spiritual things in life. The Secretary refuses to recognize or name the forces of evil loose in the world today, nor does he offer any plan to harness the forces of good inherent in free men.

These are serious charges. I have read this document carefully, and it is only after serious thought and study that I have decided to bring this matter before the House. The Secretary's report is lengthy, and I do not intend to read it all, but I shall take a few minutes to give some of the highlights.

One significant item in the lengthy report is the single paragraph on the Korean war. In listing the achievements of what the Secretary General calls the true record of the United Nations, Korea is just "another problem dealt with by the United Nations."

What would the soldiers who are fighting in Korea say about that statement? Mr. Speaker, that is an insult to every United Nations soldier who fights in bloody Korea today and to those who have already died in that undeclared war.

American soldiers in Korea will find the last sentence of the U. N. paragraph on Korea rather hard to digest. It reads:

When the attack occurred, collective United Nations action to resist the aggression was improvised and succeeded after a year of hard and destructive fighting in repelling the aggressor.

If, as the report states, the aggressors were repelled, why are we still in Korea?

Like President Truman, Secretary Lie refuses to recognize the Korean conflict as a war. He uses Communist jargon when referring to war. He calls it the United Nations struggle for peace. Communists are always talking about the struggle for peace.

The report carefully refrains from naming Russia, China, and even North Korea as aggressors. It merely states that "armed attack was launched from North Korea against the Republic of Korea."

In fact, the report never mentions Russia's or China's part in creating present world unrest, and makes no mention of world attempts to resist Communist aggression.

These omissions indicate to me Trygve Lie's fear of Russian criticism and are evidence of the partial and biased treatment accorded Communist aggression throughout the report.

The entire report bemoans the formation of regional pacts such as NATO, but again there is no reference to Russia's veto and actions which according to President Truman made such pacts necessary.

Further evidence of dishonest reporting is found in the Secretary's analysis of the present world crisis. He says that our present crisis is caused by "major conflicts and upheavals arising out of the conditions which existed at the close of the Second World War." Once again, the Secretary refuses to name Russia's attempt at world revolution and domination as even a contributing factor to our present world crisis.

Russia has since 1917 never tried to deny nor hide her objective of world revolution. Russia has publicly stated, time after time, her aims of world revolution. Why, then, should the Secretary General hesitate to call a spade a spade?

According to Secretary Lie, these same conflicts and upheavals, which are supposed to have arisen from conditions existing at the close of the Second World War, are to blame for the present world armament race.

Secretary Lie states that the most dangerous of these conflicts, which arose out of conditions existing at the close of the Second World War, is "between the Atlantic group and its supporters, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, its eastern European allies, and the People's Republic of China, or the other hand."

The Secretary charges that the Atlantic group is responsible for the conflict

in the world today. This is what he says:

First:

It has prevented the completion of a peace treaty with Germany.

Second:

It has led to a split among former allies over a peace treaty with Japan.

The report also blames this conflict between the Atlantic Pact nations and Russia for "growing tension and fear throughout the world. It has led to armed conflict in Korea, and to recurrent troubles and dangers in many parts of the world."

In his report of progress, the Secretary General states that one-fourth of the population of the world has gained political independence in the last 6 years. He fails to tell of the 630,000,000 that have become enslaved and virtual prisoners of Communist aggression. The report also fails to mention the disappearance of a nation after nation behind the iron curtain.

After taking credit for repelling the aggressor in Korea, the Secretary General also lists as accomplishments the solution and settlement of the disputes and problems in Iran, Indonesia, Greece, Palestine, India, Pakistan, Kashmir, the Berlin blockade, and the Italian peace treaty. What settlements? Mr. Lie's dreamboat touches all ports and apparently carries enough oil for all troubled waters.

The charges of violation of human rights brought against the satellite states of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania were solved, according to the report, by being made the subject of various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. The entire problem was simply treated as a U. N. accomplishment. This out and out whitewash and pigeonholing of the serious charges of violation of human rights can be applauded by no one but the Communists.

Secretary Lie admits that the rate of progress has been slow and unless the U. N. gets greater support, the danger of the bitter conflicts and historic upheavals of our times may prove too great a strain for the U. N. in its early stages of development. He predicts disaster unless member governments make the United Nations the cornerstone of their foreign policies, thus strengthening the United Nations to, first, maintain peace; second, develop more friendly relations; and, third, to work toward a better and fairer distribution of the resources of the earth. The report states that three-fourths of the world's population living in less developed countries, though independent, are strongly demanding better opportunities to improve their meager standards of living and to achieve more rapid social and political progress.

Secretary Lie's lengthy and sometimes repetitious report—over 7,000 words—mentions some 27 nations. The Communist regime in China is called the People's Republic of China. The Secretary names it several times and lists the People's Republic of China as one of the allies of Russia. The question of seating them in the U. N. is an item that he has had to postpone. But there is no

mention whatever of the Nationalist Government of China, which happens to be a member of the U. N., in the entire report.

The Secretary has accomplished one remarkable and outstanding feat. The feat lies in not once mentioning the United States which seems to be playing at least a minor role in world affairs and is at present bearing 40 percent of the entire operating cost of the United Nations.

Here we have the Secretary General of the United Nations writing a report of the United Nations' past year's accomplishments, reviewing the past 6 years' activities, posing the present and future problems, recommending procedures and policies, and last but not least, laying the ground work for next year's tremendous budget. Not once is the United States mentioned. In fact, it is not even mentioned as a geographical location. That, you must admit, is a remarkable omission. I thought at first I must have overlooked it. I read the report again. I gave special attention to the part of the report dealing with proposed financial aid programs. Surely it would take a lot of money to develop the other three-fourths of the world who were strongly demanding to improve their meager standards of living. When it comes to asking for money—no one—not even the United Nations has ever been shy or hesitant in mentioning the United States. But, no, not once in the entire report has the Secretary mentioned the United States. At least, not by name. Lest any Member of the House feel that we will not be called on for money, let me give you a quote and show you how the Secretary puts the bite on the United States without naming us.

In making his plea for using the United Nations as the main avenue through which financial aid should be channeled, Trygve Lie says:

I recognize fully the heavy costs of armaments now being borne by the same industrially developed countries which would be the source for much of this financial assistance.

Reduce this statement to percentages of present armament expenditures, and it will not be hard to figure how much the United States will be expected to pay in this world-wide scheme to distribute the resources of the earth.

In his closing admonition to the United Nations, Trygve Lie says "that the United Nations must never forget that its functions are not peace-keeping but peace-creating."

Once again Americans will find it difficult to follow the Secretary General. We in America have not been taught to think of the world as being in a constant state of turmoil. Peace to an American is a natural and understandable condition that must prevail in our way of life. Secretary Lie, however, follows the pessimistic Old World thinking: that there is no peace, there has never been peace, and there will be no peace—unless U. N.-created.

How does the Secretary propose to create this peace? Here is what he says:

The creating of conditions of peace will in a large measure be the result of providing

the economic and psychological framework within which the majority of mankind finds life livable and worth while.

Reducing this to plain English, it means that the United Nations can only create peace if and when the United States dishes out the money to make life livable and worth while for the rest of mankind.

The sixth annual report of the Secretary General to the United Nations General Assembly should serve as a warning as to where we are headed and what is expected of us.

The Secretary General in making this dishonest and biased report has shown his unfitness for the office.

Trygve Lie, as Secretary General, is still the creature of Russian bargaining, just as he was when first appointed for the 5-year term of office.

He has long overstayed his term.

His usefulness has long since been destroyed.

I am, therefore, bringing this to the attention of Ambassador Warren Austin, our representative to the United Nations, and to our State Department.

If Trygve Lie does not resign as Secretary General, he should be removed from office.

[From the New York Times of October 12, 1951]

TEXT OF LIE REPORT TO U. N. CAUTIONING MEMBERS AGAINST SOLE RELIANCE ON REGIONAL FACTS

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., October 11.—Following is the text of Secretary General Trygve Lie's introduction to his sixth annual report to the United Nations General Assembly:

"During the past year, the threat of a third world war has continued to lie heavy upon the hearts of people everywhere and to burden their lives.

"The governments have been preoccupied with emergency measures caused by the dangers and fears of the present time. The goal of a peaceful and better world proclaimed in the United Nations Charter has seemed more distant than ever.

"Whether the world is to enter upon a period of easing of tensions or whether the great conflict that has dominated world affairs since 1945 will continue on its present acutely dangerous course, it is, I believe, both wise and necessary at this time for the governments of member states and their peoples to give careful reconsideration to the place of the United Nations in the struggle for peace.

"The Charter came into force 6 years ago in a political atmosphere very different from that which exists today. Is the fundamental concept of the Charter regarding the problem of world peace still valid today or has it been disproved by subsequent events? Should the main efforts in the international field made by member states to preserve peace and to protect and promote the interests of their peoples be conducted through and in support of the United Nations or by other means?"

THE UNITED NATIONS CONCEPT

"The United Nations, it is frequently said, was founded on the assumption that the five great powers which led the struggle against Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Imperialist Japan would continue to cooperate in the peace that followed victory. Since the events of the past 6 years have led to a different result, some have come to the conclusion that the United Nations in its present form is not a workable instrument for peace and security, at least in the foreseeable fu-

ture. A few would scrap the organization altogether. A greater number would seek peace and security mainly by other means, while conserving the United Nations in a secondary position as a forum for world debate and a useful vehicle for international cooperation in economic and social matters.

"I believe it is important to recall that the founding of the United Nations was motivated by a far more fundamental and lasting concept concerning the world than a passing wartime alliance of great powers. This is that the peace and well-being of all nations and peoples have become in the present age so intimately interrelated that it is necessary for them, despite all their differences, to join in a world-wide organization looking toward security from war, freedom and independence for the peoples, and mutual economic and social progress.

"We should not forget that this judgment long antedates the United Nations. Its steadily increasing acceptance over the past 50 years is based upon one of the most revolutionary and far-reaching developments in the life of mankind since the beginning of civilization—the scientific and technological revolution of our time.

"This revolution has made possible the industrialization of a growing number of countries and has multiplied several-fold the volume of world production. It has caused the world's population to grow at an unprecedented rate. At the same time, it has brought about new and rapid means of transportation and mass communication for the interchange of ideas. These developments have intensified the impact of cultures one upon the other, and have greatly increased the economic interdependence of nations in all parts of the world. The world has shrunk while its population has grown; the potential benefits as well as the potential dangers that are coupled with closer interdependence have become more evident.

"The scientific and technological revolution has likewise increased the range and destructive power of weapons of war to an extent far beyond comparison with any previous age. The significance of distance—of the geographical separateness of nations—has been reduced almost to the vanishing point. We live in a world where men and machines can move with such speed that an armed attack can strike home upon the victim nation anywhere in the world in 24 hours or less.

"It was in the face of these inescapable realities rather than in the hope of maintaining the wartime alliance of the Five Great Powers that the governments founded the United Nations. It is true the hope was there; it is reflected in the rule of great-power unanimity in the Security Council. This hope has, however, been grievously disappointed.

"But the founders of our organization never conceived that its mere establishment would of itself remove or prevent conflicts and differences of national interests, aspirations, cultures, and beliefs, nor would it assure in advance the future good conduct and good faith of governments in all circumstances. On the contrary, they considered that from that time forward a world organization was the one essential and primary instrument, to be available in all circumstances, through which the member nations could over a period of time develop adequate means for controlling unlawful international conduct on the part of any government and for preventing those differences which inevitably arise between nations from leading to further world wars, with the consequent denial or destruction of the political, economic, and social progress of the peoples.

"It is in the light of the record of the past 6 years that I propose to review the soundness of this fundamental judgment, as well as the concept of the United Nations as the instrument for applying it."

WORLD CONFLICT AND UPHEAVALS

"Almost immediately after the establishment of the United Nations the world was faced with major conflicts and upheavals arising out of the conditions which existed at the close of the Second World War.

"We have seen the greatest and most dangerous of these conflicts—that between the Atlantic group and its supporters, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, its most dangerous of these conflicts, Eastern European Allies, and the People's Republic of China, on the other hand—absorbing the major attention of all members since it began. It has prevented the completion of a peace treaty with Germany, a country which is left in a state of de facto armed partition between East and West. It has led to a split among the former Allies over the peace treaty with Japan. It has resulted in increased armaments and in growing tension and fear throughout the world. It has led to armed conflict in Korea and to recurrent troubles and dangers in many parts of the world.

"In the United Nations itself we have felt the serious effects of these developments in almost every field of activity. Because of the requirement of five-power unanimity, the Security Council has not been able to establish the armed forces provided for in the Charter, nor has it been able to use its power thereunder to order such forces into action to maintain or restore peace and security. For the same reason, it has been impossible to establish a system for the control of atomic energy and the control and reduction of other armaments. The existing ideological conflict has had a negative influence not only on the political work of the United Nations but on some of its other efforts to achieve constructive results, especially as regards economic reconstruction and development, the widening of international trade, and other programs for economic and social betterment.

"Although the attention of the world has been focused almost exclusively upon the main political conflict, there have been other far-reaching developments of profound global significance with which the organization has had to deal since its establishment, and to which I have previously drawn attention.

"One-fourth of the population of the world has gained political independence within the span of only 6 years. The pressure of other dependent peoples toward freedom and equality has become much stronger since the war and continues to increase. Further, three-quarters of the world's population living in the less developed countries, though independent, are strongly demanding better opportunities to improve their meager standards of living and to achieve more rapid social and political progress.

"It is against the background of these events that we must weigh the record of the United Nations in order to evaluate wisely the place it should occupy in the foreign policies of governments in both the immediate and more distant future."

THE UNITED NATIONS AS A FORCE FOR PEACE

"When we consider the role of the United Nations in relation to attempts to settle peacefully disputes between nations and to prevent or put an end to armed conflict, we find that virtually all the most serious questions of the past 6 years, with the exception of the conclusion of the actual peace treaties, have been brought in one form or another to the United Nations.

"What is the true record of the Organization in these matters? The first three cases to come before the Security Council concerned the presence of British and French troops in Lebanon and Syria and of Soviet troops in Iran, and the struggle of Indonesia for independence. Following upon the Council's consideration of the first two cases,

the British and French troops were withdrawn from Lebanon and Syria and the Soviet troops from Iran. Persistent efforts by the United Nations at conciliation in Indonesia were a major factor in the achievement of independence by the Republic of Indonesia through peaceful agreement with the Netherlands.

"The United Nations has been concerned over a 5-year period with threats to the independence of Greece. It is generally recognized that the unceasing watch by the United Nations over the northern borders of Greece has contributed largely to the amelioration of a dangerous situation between that country and its neighbors.

"The problem of Palestine has been in the hands of the Organization since 1947. Following decisions of the General Assembly, the State of Israel was established, and mediation by the United Nations succeeded in ending armed conflict between Israel and the Arab States. Real peace in the Middle East has yet to be achieved, but the armistices arranged through United Nations intervention have continued in effect.

"Another problem dealt with by the United Nations since 1947 is that of the unification and independence of Korea. The future of Korea was involved in the wider world conflict and the Organization was unable to bring about an agreed peaceful solution of the problem in the succeeding 2½ years. Then, in June 1950, the armed attack was launched from North Korea against the Republic of Korea. When that attack occurred collective United Nations action to resist the aggression was improvised and succeeded, after a year of hard and destructive fighting, in repelling the aggressor.

"The dispute between India and Pakistan over the future of Kashmir has also been before the United Nations since the beginning of 1948. Here, too, fighting ceased after mediation by the Organization, although little progress has been made for a long time toward a settlement of the dispute. This question remains a matter of grave concern to the United Nations.

"The Berlin blockade was brought to the United Nations in 1948. This was the most dangerous conflict directly involving the great powers prior to the aggression in Korea, and was settled by peaceful negotiation in which United Nations channels were used.

"After the great powers had failed to agree, in the Italian Peace Treaty, on the future of the former Italian colonies, this question was brought to the United Nations for settlement. The General Assembly decided that Libya should be independent after January 1, 1952, that Somaliland should be independent after 10 years of trusteeship, and that Eritrea should constitute an autonomous unit federated with Ethiopia under the sovereignty of the Ethiopian crown. These decisions are now being carried out.

"Charges against Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania of violations of the human rights provisions of the peace treaties with these former enemy states have been the subject of various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

"It will be noted that, in all the above matters, which serve to illustrate the activities of the United Nations in the political sphere, definite decisions have been taken or recommendations made. There exist, however, a number of problems which still remain on the agenda of the relevant organs for further consideration and possible recommendations. For example, the Anglo-Egyptian dispute and the question of Trieste are retained on the agenda of the Security Council; various questions relating to China were brought to the General Assembly at its fifth session, including charges and countercharges of aggression against China, the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, the intervention of the People's Republic of China in Korea, and the

future of the island of Formosa (Taiwan); and the ever-increasing problem of the armaments of the great powers has been periodically debated in various bodies throughout the life of the Organization."

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

"The first conclusion that emerges from the above enumeration is, surely, that the governments of members have found it both wise and necessary to resort to the United Nations in their effort to settle, ameliorate, or at least contain, most of the dangerous differences and disputes that have arisen among them since the end of the Second World War, including those directly involving the interests of the great powers.

"The general practice has been to bring serious disputes over of a primary regional character to the world organization for a hearing, for the judgment of world opinion as reflected in its organs, and for the deployment of its resources in negotiation, mediation and conciliation, and in the recommendation of settlements. This practice, in turn, seems to support the basic judgment embodied in the Charter: that, in a world so closely interrelated as ours today, a serious dispute between nations in one part of the world is the concern of nations in all parts of the world.

"A second conclusion to be drawn from the record on political activity is this: in spite of the lack of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council, United Nations action has resulted in bringing about the peaceful settlement of a substantial number of serious international issues in the first six years of its existence. In other cases not yet settled, United Nations action has prevented or halted armed conflict. In still others where little or no success has yet been achieved, governments have nevertheless found no feasible alternative, no way offering a better prospect of ultimate success, than that of continuing their efforts in and through the organization.

"A third conclusion is that armed aggression anywhere, or the threat of armed conflict anywhere, is, in fact as well as in theory, becoming more and more the concern of nations everywhere. The most striking demonstration of this has been in Korea. There, for the first time in history, armed collective security action against military aggression by a world organization has been undertaken, not under some regional pact or traditional alliance, but by and under the United Nations. Furthermore, this action has been taken in a case directly involving the great-power conflict. Nations in all parts of the world have participated, including many with none of those special national interests in the area which traditionally, have been the only cause for which nations would fight. By joining in this collective security action, these nations have recognized that, in this case at least, collective security against armed aggression anywhere is a truly vital national interest of nations everywhere.

"Finally, there are the Uniting for Peace resolutions, adopted by the General Assembly at its last session, which aim at the development of an effective collective security system which could immediately be set in motion in case of an emergency.

"These resolutions, I hope, reflect the beginning of a significant evolution in the policies of the governments of most member states concerning the whole problem of security from aggression.

"Faced with the great East-West conflict and the resulting deadlock in the Security Council, governments have previously directed their efforts toward the building of mutual defense alliances, backed by rearmament. This process still continues, though with a difference. Before the attack on Korea, the tendency in many quarters was to

look upon these alliances as the only effective means of protection from aggression, because the Security Council might be unable to act. Since the attack, there has been a growing recognition that such alliances, while important and useful as supplementary measures of defense, cannot be regarded as substitutes for a United Nations collective security system. There has also been a growing recognition that such a system can be established and can be made to work under the present Charter.

"It was this reappraisal which led to the adoption of the 'uniting for peace' recommendations. It remains to be determined whether member nations are now prepared fully to apply the recommendations. If they do so, the United Nations will in the future be able to act effectively in all circumstances against armed aggression, even if the Security Council should be unable to discharge its primary responsibility in this respect."

RECORD OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN OTHER FIELDS

"What has been the experience of members over the past 6 years in pursuit of other purposes set forth in the Charter—such purposes as economic and social advancement, equal right and self-determination of peoples, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the advancement of dependent peoples toward self-government or independence, and the further development and application of international law? Has the universal approach represented by the United Nations Charter and system proved in practice to be wise and necessary, above and beyond the likewise important national and regional efforts toward these ends?

"It is true that by far the largest international programs of economic aid for recovery from the effects of the Second World War have been carried on outside the United Nations, although they have contributed greatly to the capacity of the participating nations to join in achieving the objectives of the Charter. Outside these programs, however, the United Nations system on the whole is gradually developing into the main center for international planning and action of both an emergency and a longer term character toward these goals.

"To demonstrate the scope of the Organization's activity it is only necessary to recall the work carried on under the Economic and Social Council, with its three regional economic commissions and its nine "functional" commissions dealing with world-wide economic and social problems, as well as the work of the 11 specialized agencies—the International Labor Organization with 64 members, the Food and Agriculture Organization with 66, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization with 64, the International Civil Aviation Organization with 57, the World Health Organization with 78, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, each with 50, the Universal Postal Union with 86, the International Telecommunication Union with 84, the International Refugee Organization with 18, and the World Meteorological Organization with 66. It is hoped that the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization will be brought into operation in the near future and, in addition, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade are now provisionally in force among 32 nations.

"Under the United Nations itself, and directly responsible to the General Assembly, are the Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, the Korean Reconstruction Agency, the International Children's Emergency Fund, and the newly established Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

"I come now to a nonpolitical activity that is of prime importance to the achievement of long-term stability in many parts of the world. I refer, of course, to the technical

assistance program for economic development, social welfare and public administration. In many respects, this effort is unique as a United Nations activity when viewed from the aspect of Secretariat organization, because of the technical assistance program of the United Nations itself is an operational function carried on within a Secretariat which is largely concerned with research and advisory duties. Indeed, apart from urgent political questions, there is perhaps no area of the work of the United Nations that should attract more support from all members than this program, and which is more important to the future of the Organization. For, the fundamental thesis of this program is to help peoples to help themselves, by introducing them to the skills and organizational techniques necessary for the most effective economic use of their own resources, personnel, and traditions.

"The main fields of technical assistance activity of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are economic development, agriculture and health programs, wide educational and vocational training schemes, social welfare in its limitless variety and, finally, the improvement of public administration, without which effective social organization and action are not possible in the modern state.

"Both the regular and expanded programs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies have made substantial and heartening progress in the past year. Reviewing the work of the United Nations and the agencies together, over five hundred requests have been received from 64 countries, and agreements have been signed with 45 governments to provide experts and other assistance. These are in addition to the regular work of technical assistance carried on by the United Nations and the specialized agencies in their respective fields of action. It should be said that these programs are being developed side by side with bilateral and regional programs of technical assistance outside the United Nations system.

"In the field of social welfare and human rights, there has been an increasing recognition of the solemn obligations imposed by the charter. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights stands as a beacon of hope and progress for peoples everywhere. Its potentially vast effect upon the future of mankind has as yet only begun to make itself manifest, but the trend is already apparent. Parts of the declaration are being written into national constitutions, while civil rights in other countries are upheld by references to it. Much other action toward promoting social welfare and a wider observance of human rights is also under way in the United Nations, including the drafting of a Covenant on Human Rights and measures for its implementation, the world-wide battle against the abuse of narcotic drugs, and work on such problems as rights of minorities, status of women, freedom of information, trade union rights, abolition of slavery and forced labor, prisoners of war and protection of refugees and stateless persons.

"During the past six years, the United Nations has clearly become the main international instrument for the advancement of dependent peoples towards self-government and independence. In addition to the trusteeship system, which now covers 11 Trust Territories, the principle of international accountability and concern for all dependent territories is being applied.

"Virtually all important developments in the evolution of international law during the past 6 years have been closely connected with the United Nations. The Charter itself has become the central instrument of international law, and one of the most important features of the development of that law is the continuing and cumulative effort to implement the Charter in all its aspects. Apart from the Charter, various international con-

ventions designed to develop or clarify international law have been or are being prepared under United Nations auspices. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the General Assembly and is now in force, although a number of important member states have not yet ratified it. A convention on the status of refugees has been completed this year. The establishment of a court to judge crimes under international law is being studied. The International Law Commission has produced a number of valuable drafts, including a draft code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind. There has been an increasing tendency for states to refer their legal disputes to the International Court of Justice, which has declared the existing state of the law in six judgments and seven advisory opinions."

EXPERIENCE HAS CONFIRMED THE CORRECTNESS OF THE UNITED NATIONS APPROACH

"What conclusions should be drawn from a review even so necessarily brief and incomplete as the above?

"The first is that, in these matters as in political questions, the governments of member states have once again confirmed in practice the concept reflected in the United Nations Charter that world organization is essential for the advancement of the welfare of their peoples.

"A second conclusion to be drawn from the record is that already many important programs benefiting hundreds of millions of people throughout the world have been promoted through the United Nations system with good results. There have been and continue to be setbacks, failures, disappointments. The great political conflicts of our time inevitably have reduced the effectiveness of some, though not all, of these programs.

"At best, the rate of progress is slow in projects involving the voluntary cooperation of many nations. Viewed from year to year, the lag between proposal and debate on the one hand, and performance on the other, has often seemed disheartening. But over a period of 6 years, the perspective, I claim, is different."

NECESSITY FOR STRONG UNITED NATIONS ACTION

"As I have already said, it seems to me that the record of the past 6 years has shown the United Nations to be a practical instrument for all nations seeking peace, security, and the well-being and advancement of their peoples.

"The organization is still in its early stages of development. No matter how right its principles or how practical its machinery have proved to be in many fields, the United Nations depends for its ultimate success upon the extent of the support given to these principles and the use made of this machinery by member states. Unless these are realized in sufficient measure, there is danger that the bitter conflicts and historic upheavals of our times may prove too great a strain for a world structure that is still in the early stages of development.

"I believe this disaster may be avoided if the governments will act promptly, vigorously and wisely to make the United Nations—in fact and in all respects—a cornerstone of their foreign policy, and thus further strengthen the power of the United Nations to maintain peace, to develop more friendly relations, and to work toward a better and fairer distribution of the resources of the earth.

"Because of the responsibilities placed upon my as Secretary General by the Charter, I feel it is my duty to submit to this end some thoughts and suggestions for consideration at the sixth session of the General Assembly and in other United Nations organs."

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF UNITED NATIONS COLLECTIVE SECURITY

"Despite the heavy loss of life, the tragedy and suffering involved, I consider that one of the most encouraging developments of the past year for the preservation of world peace has been the United Nations collective security action in Korea. Equally so is the decision in principle to prepare for similar collective action in any future case of armed aggression, on the recommendation of the Security Council or the General Assembly. This decision to establish a framework for collective security action supplementary to the system intended by the Charter must be considered a milestone in the organization's history.

"Progress has been made toward implementing this decision through the preparatory work of the Collective Measures Committee. But I think it important that the governments of members should express more clearly and explicitly the commitment—subject of course to their respective constitutional processes and to the obligation of self-defense—of their foreign policy, their armed forces and their economic power to this developing world-wide system of collective security.

"There should be no conflict between obligations arising, on the one hand, from regional and mutual defense pacts concluded in conformity with the Charter and obligations arising, on the other hand, from the United Nations collective-security system. Any serious threat or act of armed aggression calling for action under such pacts will also call for action by the United Nations itself, since the latter must, under the Charter, always be concerned whenever and wherever peace is threatened or broken. Furthermore, it is not possible to achieve lasting security from war by regional pacts alone. At best, those pacts can of themselves only lead to a precarious balance of power.

"It is, I believe, in the vital national interest of member states desiring peace that their regional security commitments be more clearly regarded as complementary to their primary obligation to join in defending world peace under the United Nations. This is essential if the United Nations is to develop a world collective-security system that will be a really effective deterrent to armed aggression and a barrier against war.

"In the present state of the world, it is of the utmost importance for the preservation of peace that the United Nations should be assured of sufficient armed power and economic resources for collective security to deter any nation from embarking upon armed aggression anywhere.

"At the same time, we must never lose sight of the fact that this strong collective-security system is being organized for the purpose of preventing war, not waging it. We are not seeking to organize a system that can be used as a threat against the equal rights of any nation or any group of nations to determine their own mode of life in their own way. One of the basic conditions for the success of the United Nations is the principle of peaceful coexistence for all types of political and social systems, within a universal framework of law as laid down in the Charter. This principle also carries with it the obligation upon all states not to interfere in the internal affairs of other states."

FURTHER EFFORTS AT PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

"We must continue and redouble our efforts to use all the available resources of the United Nations system to make the principle of coexistence work in fact, which it has not done so far.

"The reasons which prompted the framers of the Charter to place the primary responsibility for peace and security upon the Security Council are as sound today as they were in 1945. There can be no lasting peace

in the world unless a peaceful settlement can be achieved between the two groups of great powers, and a peaceful settlement is something that, in the end, can be reached only by negotiations, mutual concession, and the development of mutual confidence.

"I believe that the development of a strong and effective United Nations collective security system, combined with renewed efforts at mediation and conciliation, can improve the chances of ameliorating and, in time, settling the great political conflicts that most endanger world peace today. The greater the ability of the United Nations to foil attempts to solve conflicts of national interest by force, the more likely will it be that those conflicts can be settled by negotiation. A realization of the political stresses of the day is essential to the achievement of lasting settlements.

"In this connection, I hope that the member nations will fully develop and use the Peace Observation Commission. It is an essential part of the growing system of collective security, and the presence of the Commission's observers on any troubled border in the world could not fail to act as a deterrent to armed aggression.

"In all our efforts to implement the 'Uniting for Peace' resolutions it is necessary to keep clearly in mind the ultimate goals of making chapter VII of the Charter work as it was intended to work, and of controlling and reducing all armaments and armed forces. What we are doing is seeking to build a second line of defense against war in case the first line of defense should fail.

"Nevertheless, it remains that the Security Council continues and must continue to bear the primary responsibility for the preservation of peace and it should lose no opportunity to exert all its efforts to settle the conflicts threatening world peace today. There appears to be little or no hope at the present time of making progress toward establishing the forces contemplated under article 43 of the Charter and of reaching the necessary unanimity of agreement on a system of control and reduction of armaments. But the unforeseeable course of events may change the prospects for the better at some future time, near or distant, and we should do everything that is possible to encourage this result."

PERIODIC MEETINGS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

"I wish to recall the proposal for the inauguration of periodic meetings of the Security Council included in the memorandum last year on a 20-year program for achieving peace through the United Nations. Because of the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations and the involvement in Korea of forces of the People's Republic of China, I have not since renewed this proposal because I believed that aggression in Korea should first be brought to an end.

"At a later time to be determined in the light of developments and the world situation in general, the proposal for the inauguration of the periodic meetings of the Security Council should be considered. The existing practice of holding meetings of Foreign Ministers outside the United Nations needs to be supplemented by meetings within that organization which would provide full opportunity at regular intervals for a periodic testing of the possibilities of reducing world tensions, of ameliorating conflicts and of arriving at settlements of outstanding issues. I believe that it would strengthen the United Nations if special meetings of the Security Council, attended by foreign ministers or heads of governments, could be held with this purpose in view. In my opinion, the presence of the nonpermanent members of the Council at such meetings would improve the chances for constructive results. In the United Nations, the medium and smaller powers have done

much, and can do much more toward moderating and conciliating opposing positions."

UNIVERSALITY OF MEMBERSHIP

"I have consistently supported the principle of universality of membership in the United Nations. The trend of events in the past year has in some ways, although not in all, seemed to make the early realization of this goal more difficult. Nevertheless, I remain convinced that it would be in the interests of world peace and an important step toward strengthening the influence of the organization if all the states now outside it could be brought into membership within a reasonable time. I believe that it would be wise and right for member states to apply the membership tests of article 4 of the Charter primarily in the light of these considerations and of the interests of the inhabitants of the countries concerned.

"The conduct of certain governments, both inside and outside the United Nations, may be condemned from time to time by the organization. But the latter's influence both for world peace and upon the conduct of governments in relation to the obligations and objectives of the Charter would undoubtedly be greater if all such governments were within the organization."

OTHER STEPS TOWARD STRENGTHENING WORK OF UNITED NATIONS FOR PEACE

"The prosecution and further development of the expanded United Nations program of technical assistance is of the highest importance. It is in the national interest of all members of our organization and the specialized agencies should be the main vehicles of technical assistance between nations. I recognize that this approach sometimes poses administrative problems. Nevertheless, the overriding consideration, in my opinion, should be the application of the first principle stated in article 2 of the Charter: 'The organization is based on the sovereign equality of all its members'.

"This means that in technical assistance, as in other matters, the old relationship of the powerful to the weak, of the giver to the receiver should be replaced by a cooperative program based on equal rights and obligations, in which all participate according to their capacity. In a world in which most of the formerly underdeveloped areas have risen, or are rising, to positions of independence and political strength, this is all the more necessary if we are to reach our goal of a stable and peaceful society.

"We are emerging into a new era in which the great and heavily populated states of Asia are seeking to telescope the generations of technical achievement of the West into a shorter span. Their goal, aiming as it does at improving the welfare of their peoples, should have the concrete support in deeds of the industrially advanced nations; and the deeds that will count most and will be remembered longest will be those that contribute to raising the level of economic and administrative skill, combined with capital aid for general economic development. Indeed, this applies not only to the newly emergent states of Asia, and to the peoples of Africa who are also moving toward a new life, but also to the older communities of Latin America, where great natural resources and a deep desire for improvement invite the contribution of more advanced states. From now on, constructive international economic activity should, therefore, find its most creative outlet in the programs of technical assistance and economic development through capital aid made available to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

"I hope that members will find it possible to develop and carry out, through the United Nations and its related agencies, a long-range program of financial assistance for economic development directly related to the technical-assistance program. Here again, as in the case of technical assistance, the same reasons

are valid for using the United Nations as the main avenue through which financial aid should be channeled.

"I recognize fully the heavy cost of armaments now being borne by the same industrially developed countries which would be the source for much of this financial assistance. Nevertheless, I believe that such a United Nations program would contribute both to their own ultimate security from war and to their own economic well-being. By increasing the volume of production, raising living standards and alleviating population pressures the program could, within a period of a few years, reduce the basic causes of unrest and violent upheavals in many parts of the world; at the same time it could, by increasing the utilization of unused resources, so expand world economy and world trade that all countries would benefit. If wisely conceived and administered as an integral part of an over-all United Nations program for peace, it would hasten the day when nations could again reduce their armaments. When we recall that the military costs of member States are now running at a rate of more than \$100,000,000,000 a year, it is readily apparent that progress toward peace, leading to a reduction of these military costs, would result in net savings representing many times the cost of an effective United Nations program of financial assistance for economic development.

"The Middle East is one of the areas where the connection between financial aid for economic development and the effort to settle political conflicts is most apparent. There, and in Korea, are two of the most urgent challenges to effective action by the United Nations—one for economic development, the other for economic reconstruction. In both cases the political future, and the issue of peace or war, will be vitally affected by what the United Nations does, or fails to do, in the economic field.

"There are other fields where further progress toward more effective work in the economic and social fields may be possible. In some cases progress is possible even if the present central political conflict continues unabated. In other cases, it will depend upon the amelioration of this conflict. For example, trade between the Western World and the Soviet Union and its allies has been sharply reduced for political and military reasons, although a general expansion of world trade is in the economic interest of all concerned. If the testing of possibilities for fruitful political negotiations should have positive results, the possibilities for simultaneous progress toward the removal of the present barriers to trade will be improved.

"It is my deep conviction that it would be a grave mistake to permit the pressures, great as they are, of immediate political and military problems to distract the United Nations from those longer-range problems upon the settlement of which international stability and good feeling will depend, namely, those concerned with raising the living standards of peoples everywhere, particularly of those nations which have yet to attain a reasonable level of subsistence for the great masses of their populations.

"The United Nations must never forget that its functions are not 'peace-keeping' but 'peace-creating,' and that the creation of conditions of peace will in a large measure be the result of providing the economic and psychological framework within which the majority of mankind finds life livable and worth while."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice several times the gentleman used the expression "redistribute" or "distribute

the resources of the world." My thought all the time has been that the resources they were distributing were United States resources.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is what I meant. If I said "of the world" I was incorrect. "Redistribute the resources of the United States" is what I meant.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I compliment the gentleman. He brings to us information which some of us have not the opportunity or ability to collect, information which, in my judgment, at least, is information that we must have if we are going to perform our duty here as Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I hope the Members will take an opportunity to analyze that report, because if they do, they are in for a shock if they read all of it.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I followed the gentleman's very excellent speech and analysis of this report very closely. May I ask the gentleman, who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, whether the United Nations Charter, to which he referred several times, has not as its basic purpose to deal with aggressors? That is one of the main purposes of the United Nations Charter, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is for collective security.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Against aggression?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. In this report is there any recognition of the fact that the real and the bloody aggressor in the world today is the Soviet regime?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; that is glossed over. As I said, it actually places the responsibility on those who do not agree with Russia for present conditions.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is there any recognition of the fact that the people of China and the peoples of Eastern Europe are really enslaved by the present regimes in those countries?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Not one word.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I also want to commend the gentleman on his very excellent presentation and for his forethought in bringing this timely issue to the House. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he does not think that the time is here when we should do some realistic thinking so far as the United Nations is concerned, and I would like to inquire if the gentleman could tell the House of anything being done in the Committee on Foreign Affairs to bring to light these conditions which he has just described in this report?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I know nothing officially that is being done in the committee. I have the feeling, personally, that there is a good deal of doubt being raised in the minds of people as to whether or not the U. N. is doing the job for which it was organized.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would further like to ask the gentleman what attitude the Committee on Foreign Affairs is taking toward the situation in Korea. Are we going to sit complacently by for another winter and let these boys endure those indescribable hardships that they went through last year without making some effort to bring to an end that conflict?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I just wonder if we can. I wonder if there is any committee in Congress that could effect that change. It is an undeclared war.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Well, is it a war, and if it is a war, between whom is it a war?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, if we are to believe the reports, it is a war between the United Nations and the so-called aggressors in the form of Communist China and the North Koreans; the Red government of North Korea.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wish to inform the gentleman that I was amazed to learn within the last few days that United States soldiers participating in the conflict are engaged in what they call peacetime action. I was amazed that a soldier killed in that action receives benefits from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation as he would if he had suffered injuries in an accident while in a civilian status.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is an important observation, if it is true.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is true.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman ought to bring that matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I was amazed to find it is true.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I did not know that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is true, and that is what is going on this very day. They consider our soldiers as engaged in peacetime action; not any war.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But they are dying.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is there not some way that either we in this House or the American people can bring an end to this situation?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You can only bring it to an end at the next election, in my opinion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman said they are dying. I am sure the gentleman is aware that in the first 16 months of the war in Korea we, in the United States, lost more men than we lost in that length of time in either the First or the Second World Wars.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, I understand that is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman knows that there are many men in the Walter Reed Hospital and at the Naval Hospital and hospitals all over the country who are not receiving some of the benefits of wartime casualties. We passed that legislation here and the gentleman was evidently present when it was passed. Gradually the men are receiving benefits that they should as if it was a real war, and yet it is not called a real war. They are receiving hospitalization that the men of World War II and World War I are receiving. They are receiving for their wounds that same compensation. However, some legislation has not yet passed. Yesterday we passed a bill granting them additional benefits, but the well men have not received any of the benefits like the veterans received under the Bill of Rights in World War II. They are considered in this war—I call it a war—to receive the same benefits almost entirely that World War II veterans are receiving.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Do I correctly understand they are receiving those benefits now?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. The men in the hospitals do not get the veterans benefits until they are discharged, but they are treated just as if they were in war.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentlewoman heard the gentleman from Colorado make the statement about their not being covered. There seems to be some conflict here. Are they covered or are they not?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that the men that are being discharged are receiving the same rates of compensation as the World War II men are receiving.

Mr. CHENOWETH. If the gentleman will yield, I received a letter in just the last 2 days from a veteran just returned from Korea, a boy who was engaged in that action. He inquired concerning the benefits to which he is entitled on his return. He said that about all he found he was entitled to was a flag to drape his casket when he died. That was his observation. His letter complained very bitterly about the reception he received. I called to the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin just now that the action this boy was engaged in is not a wartime action but, under our conception of Korea, is a peacetime action, and I presume under our laws he would not be entitled to the benefits of a veteran. That is a rather unfortunate, a deplorable, and an unconscionable situation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. If that is true, I think the Congress has the responsibility and should investigate that. I believe the committee of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts would be the proper committee to consider it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think it should be done immediately.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was he a Regular Army officer?

Mr. CHENOWETH. He was an enlisted man.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Fighting in this war?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Not a war, this is a peacetime action; it is not a war.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. I think we have already passed legislation which gives Korean veterans compensation, hospitalization, and insurance. The only thing they do not receive is this bonus and matters under the GI laws. I understand the bill we passed yesterday makes them eligible for the loans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We passed that yesterday.

Mr. CAMP. I do not think there is any doubt about it. The legislation has already been passed.

Mr. CHENOWETH. This is the distinction. I think a boy who returns who is well and who has suffered no disability receives practically no benefits, but the boy who is disabled does come in under those bills.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the bill we passed yesterday allows for loans. However, the gentleman is absolutely correct. We ought to pass before we adjourn the GI bills of rights we passed for World War II veterans. I have bills and others have bills which would make that provision law for these men. I have had letters on this subject. The men are very bitter about the situation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Does not the gentlewoman think the time is here when we should recognize some obligation to these boys?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, but I also think it is the duty of every Member of Congress to see that that is done. I do not think it depends on one or two or three Members. I think every one of us should see that it is done, and we could if we would.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very forceful and very informative speech. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I also wish to compliment the gentleman, particularly on that portion of his speech which points out the activities of the Secretary in connection with the United Nations. I for one believe that the present regime of Soviet Russia and the other Red regimes do not represent the people of Russia or these other iron-curtain countries. I believe these gangster regimes should be expelled from the United Nations. The United Nations will never amount to anything until they are expelled, and until a representation that really represents the Russian people and the other people takes their place.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Of course, that goes to the whole basic agreement in the Charter. If you are going to kick them out you will have to do that, but I doubt that there are means provided in the Charter itself to get rid of them.

I agree with the gentleman so far as the thought is concerned.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. If they are aggressors, which I believe they are, then they should be dealt with as such. I believe on that basis they can be expelled.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

SPECIAL ORDER

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes following the conclusion of the special orders today.)

The SPFAKER pro tempore [Mr. HARRIS]. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ARE YOU BETTER OFF?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Truman, addressing a luncheon of Democrats from 11 Western States in the gold room of the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco on September 4, 1951, made this statement:

We have operated the Government for the benefit of all the people since 1933, and that is the reason we are in the condition we are. We succeeded—

Said President Truman—

In making farmers, laboring men, and industry prosperous. The test of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and all that the Democratic Party has done for the country since March 4, 1933, lies in the answer to a simple question: Are you better off today than you were in the last year of the Old Deal? I wonder if there is anybody here who can say "No" to that—I do not believe there is.

Since this speech by the President asking this question, a great propaganda machine of President Truman's spend-thrift bureaucracy in Washington is now playing that tune "Are you better off?"

The President, heading a powerful secret oligarchy in a spending spree unmatched in all American history, seeks to console the people that they are better off than ever before.

This first session of the Eighty-second Congress, now drawing to a close, has authorized total spending slightly in excess of \$100,000,000,000.

This is as much money as the New Deal spenders dished out under Franklin D. Roosevelt in the biggest spending year of World War II—the fiscal year 1945.

Yet we are at peace, the President tells us.

What will our budget be when war comes?

True, we have had 87,000 battlefield casualties in Korea to date. But we are not at war, says President Truman. Actually, chimes Secretary of State Dean Acheson, we are holding the line for peace.

What will our casualties be when Truman and Acheson are ready to admit that we are in a state of war?

The Truman-Acheson squanderbund declares proudly that they are the peace party. What does the record show?

During the last 50 years we have had five Republican Presidents. Not one of them had a battlefield casualty reported during his term.

But what of our three most recent Democratic Presidents in the White House?

Under Woodrow Wilson we had 334,734 battle casualties.

Under Franklin D. Roosevelt we had 994,893 battle casualties.

Under Harry S. Truman we have had 87,604 battle casualties—and Truman still has 15 months to go to the end of his administration.

But there is one difference between President Truman and his Democratic predecessors. Wilson's battle casualties were incurred in war. Franklin D. Roosevelt's battle casualties were incurred in war. But Truman's 87,604 battle casualties were incurred in peace.

Here is the box score.

Republican battle casualties, 50 years:

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Theodore Roosevelt..... | 0 |
| William H. Taft..... | 0 |
| Warren G. Harding..... | 0 |
| Calvin Coolidge..... | 0 |
| Herbert Hoover..... | 0 |

And here are the Democratic battle casualties in 35 years:

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Woodrow Wilson..... | 334,734 |
| Franklin D. Roosevelt..... | 994,893 |
| Harry S. Truman..... | 87,604 |
| Total..... | 1,417,231 |

Who is better off under this irresponsible spendthrift oligarchy of deceit, defeat, and retreat?

Who is better off under today's reign of communism, crime, and corruption in Washington?

Certainly those who are better off today do not include the 3,700 American boys who were caught in the Sunday morning death trap at Pearl Harbor.

Many of those boys died from wounds inflicted by bombs made from scrap steel shipped from the United States under the Roosevelt foreign-trade policies.

Are the mothers and the fathers of our 1,400,000 war casualties better off?

Are the blind, insane, legless, armless soldiers in our veterans hospitals better off?

What of those who hold \$136,000,000,000 in Government bonds? Under the Roosevelt-Truman inflation policies, the purchasing power of these savings has been reduced by \$68,000,000,000. Are these bondholders better off?

About 80,000,000 Americans own life insurance policies. The purchasing power of their insurance has been reduced by \$30,000,000,000 by inflation. Are they better off?

There are several million elderly people in this country living on pensions and annuities in the sunset of life. The value of their pensions has been cut in half. Are they better off?

The Truman 50-cent dollar means confiscation—confiscation of one-half of every veteran's pension, one-half of every old-age pension, one-half of every school endowment, one-half of every benefaction given in the past to the support of any church or charity. Are these people and these vital institutions of civilization better off under the Truman spendthrifts?

The Treasury report now shows Government trust funds in the amount of almost \$14,000,000,000. These are the pay-

roll taxes collected during the last 15 years from millions of workers for the social security funds.

But the money was spent as fast as it was collected. All we have in the Treasury today to represent these so-called "trust funds" is a fine bunch of Treasury IOU's. When the money is needed to provide the pensions covered by those taxes the funds will have to be collected once more from the people, either in taxes or in the sale of more Government bonds to the general public. Are the millions of prudent Americans who have been paying into these trust funds better off?

Under Roosevelt and Truman we have given away more than \$100,000,000,000 in overseas gifts and grants. In doing so we have depleted our forests, our mines, our precious God-given natural resources half a century ahead of the calendar.

Only 20 years ago our total Federal tax collections were less than \$4,000,000,000 a year. This year total Federal taxes will run as high as \$62,000,000,000. Are the taxpayers better off?

Today every man, woman, and child in this land carries a debt load of \$1,700, his per capita share of the Roosevelt-Truman national debt of \$257,000,000,000. This debt amounts to almost \$7,000 for each and every one of our 36,000,000 families.

This administration is the author of war, debt, inflation, and shocking corruption of American life and morals.

Under this moral break-down in Washington, Communists have been permitted to invade every department and every agency of the Federal establishment.

The disciples of godless communism are at work at the very vitals of American government.

These traitors gave our priceless atomic secrets to the spies of the Kremlin.

Yet when those spies were uncovered in their evil work the President told us that it was only a red herring.

Secretary Acheson would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. But he did not hesitate to turn his back on Douglas MacArthur.

Two years after Acheson refused to turn his back on the convicted Alger Hiss, President Truman announced publicly that Acheson would be his Secretary of State as long as he remained in the White House.

Traitors, spies, and saboteurs robbed us of our greatest weapon for security and peace. There have been at least two atomic explosions within Russia during the last 2 years. Yet President Truman, by Executive order, has sealed in the White House safe the personnel records of all those suspected of Communist affiliation within the Federal Government. Truman's iron curtain protects the vital records which would enable Congress to expose every commie and every fellow-traveler on the Government payroll.

From 1933 onward, communism was sheltered, protected, coddled, and befriended in New Deal Washington.

Today that shocking national betrayal is shielded from public view by secrecy and censorship.

But there is a core of patriotism and national devotion in this mighty land which one day will wash away these dikes and secrecy and intrigue with a powerful sweep of indignation and revolution.

The great heart of America will speak again.

Freedom will not be snuffed out by five-percenters.

Liberty will never die in a doled deep-freeze.

Pastel mink coats may warm for a time the callous hides of the plunderers and rake-off artists; but mink coats will never smother the instincts of freedom which lives and grows in the hearts of 150,000,000 devoted Americans—men and women who are pledged to support and sustain orderly constitutional government, and freedom under law.

The little men of boodle and corruption will be swept away like so many broken sticks before the tide of a mighty river.

America has been drugged by fraud, fakery, and lies.

But the spirit of freedom did not die.

The clarion call to battle will find the hosts of freedom moving like an avalanche—to sweep away to a well-deserved oblivion the traitors, spies, and corruptionists.

Then, the sunlight of freedom will light the fair land again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ROBERT MARSHALL FOUNDATION

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted some investigations in New York and elsewhere concerning the Robert Marshall Foundation.

The report of the investigation shows that on September 24, 1942, the Honorable Martin Dies, of Texas, then chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, arose on this floor to a point of personal privilege to answer an attack on himself by the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Martin Dies is a very distinguished American, and a great patriot, and I sincerely hope that the people of Texas will return him to the next session of Congress. It is becoming increasingly clear that if the Roosevelt administration had cooperated with Martin Dies and his committee in a sincere effort to ferret out and expose Communist spies and fellow-travelers then in the Government service, some of the traitorous acts since revealed could certainly have been prevented. Instead the administration attacked and smeared Martin Dies day in and day out and covered up for the spies and traitors on the Federal payroll.

During the course of Martin Dies' remarks on September 24, 1942, he had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the last will and testament of one Robert Marshall, a resident of the State of New York and late Chief of the Recreation Division of the United States Forestry Service.

Robert Marshall, who died without spouse or issue, left an estate appraised

and valued at \$1,514,721.75, almost \$100,000 of which had already found its way into the treasuries of subversive and Communist organizations, when Martin Dies made his speech in 1942. Some of the money went to the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which was found by Attorney General Francis Biddle in 1942 to be subversive and communistic after an exhaustive investigation by the FBI.

THE ROBERT MARSHALL WILL

Mr. Speaker, the will of Robert Marshall was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable Martin Dies in 1942, and I shall not reinsert it here. I shall, however, insert certain extracts from the will.

Robert Marshall appointed his brother, James Marshall, as executor, and his other brother, George Marshall, as alternate executor, to serve "without bond or security of any kind, in any jurisdiction, for the faithful performance of his duties."

Robert Marshall made only one bequest in his will, that being \$3,000 to Herbert K. Clark, of Saranac Lake, N. Y. He directed his executor to divide the remainder of his estate into four parts—the first two-fourths of which he gave to Gardner Jackson, of Chevy Chase, Md.; George Marshall, of New York; Heber Blankenhorn, of Washington; Jerry O'Connell, of Butte, Mont.; and Raphael Zon, of St. Paul, Minn., in trust, to invest and reinvest and to apply income and principal in their unlimited discretion for the following purposes:

The education of the people of the United States of America to the necessity and desirability of the development and organization of unions of persons engaged in work or of unemployed persons and the promotion and advancement of an economic system in the United States based upon the theory of production for use and not for profit.

The third quarter of his estate he devised and bequeathed to his brother, James Marshall, Roger Baldwin, and John Finnerty, of New York; Edwin S. Smith and Gardner Jackson, of Washington, D. C., and Chevy Chase; likewise in trust for the purpose of:

The safeguarding and advancement of the cause of civil liberties in the United States of America and the various States and subdivisions thereof by all lawful means and actions, with full power and authority to the trustees to print, publish, and distribute pamphlets, books, magazines, and newspapers and generally to use any and all lawful means to bring to the knowledge of the citizens of the United States of America the importance and necessity of preserving and safeguarding the cause of civil liberties.

The remaining one-fourth he devised and bequeathed to Sterling Yard, William Zimmerman, Jr., and Irving Clark, of Washington, D. C.; George Marshall, of New York; and Claus Murie, of Jackson, Wyo., for the following purposes:

The preservation of the wilderness conditions in outdoor America, including but not limited to, the preservation of areas embracing primitive conditions of transportation, vegetation, and fauna.

This will was executed on the 12th day of July 1938 as shown by a certified photostat that I hold in my hands, and was witnessed by Catherine Maltby

Blaisdell and Thomas C. Blaisdell, and following the death of Robert Marshall on November 11, 1939, was admitted to probate in New York County, N. Y., on January 12, 1940.

Following the probate of the will, three trusts were established by the trustees named in the will—the Robert Marshall Foundation, the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust, and the Robert Marshall Wilderness Fund.

It is to the first two named that I wish to draw attention, since the wilderness fund was apparently a worthy purpose and expended only some \$100,000.

SUBVERSIVE AND COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS RECEIVE HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities recently checked into this estate to find what had happened to the money since Martin Dies made his speech in 1942 listing disbursements to Communist and subversive organizations of almost \$100,000. I have been furnished by the committee with voluminous records showing further disbursements of funds from this estate by the trustees of the Robert Marshall Foundation and the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust amounting to almost \$1,000,000, most of which, according to photostats of the actual checks themselves taken from the files of the New York Trust Co., was paid to subversive and Communist organizations, so designated by both the Attorney General of the United States and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

These disbursements were made over a period from October 1, 1942, to March 22, 1951, and among the subversive organizations I note that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties received \$56,000, and its successor, the Civil Rights Congress received \$63,000. The National Lawyers Guild, legal arm of the Communist Party, got \$15,250. The National Negro Congress got \$54,530. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare got \$14,000. The Southern Negro Youth Conference got \$30,000. The Federated Press got \$29,000. The Chicago Star, which is a Communist Midwest publication and now defunct, got \$10,000, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include herein a partial list of disbursements of the Robert Marshall Foundation:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Ades, Bernard | \$2,110.00 |
| Allied Labor News | 16,150.00 |
| American Youth Congress | 2,750.00 |
| American Youth for Democracy | 5,000.00 |
| Blankenhorn, Heber | 2,500.00 |
| California Eagle | 3,000.00 |
| California Labor School | 6,500.00 |
| Challenge | 4,000.00 |
| Chicago Star | 10,000.00 |
| Civil Rights Congress | 63,500.00 |
| Council for Pan-American Democracy | 8,000.00 |
| Farm Research | 21,000.00 |
| Farmers Educational & Cooperative Co. of America | 1,500.00 |
| Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America | 86,000.00 |
| Farmers Union, Eastern Division | 4,000.00 |
| Farmers Union, Northeastern Division | 19,500.00 |
| Farmers Union of the Suffield Milk Shed | 1,000.00 |
| Federated Press | 29,200.00 |
| Highlander Folk School | 5,000.00 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Marshall, George | \$81.93 |
| Minnesota Leader | 5,000.00 |
| National Council of Scientific, Professional, Art, and White Collar Organizations | 7,500.00 |
| National Federation for Constitutional Liberties | 56,000.00 |
| National Lawyers Guild | 15,250.00 |
| National War-time Conference | 2,000.00 |
| The New World | 25,000.00 |
| O'Connell, Jerry | 3,366.85 |
| Pacific Northwest Labor School | 11,500.00 |
| The People's Voice | 25,000.00 |
| Seattle Labor School | 2,500.00 |
| Southern Conference Educational Fund | 3,000.00 |
| Southern Conference for Human Welfare | 14,000.00 |
| Southern Negro Youth Congress | 30,750.00 |
| Vincent, Merle D. | 215.08 |
| Washington New Dealer | 1,000.00 |
| Wolf, Henry H. | 1,500.00 |
| Yergan, Max | 625.00 |
| Young Progressives of America | 2,500.00 |
| Zon Raphael | 911.62 |

THE TRUSTEES NAMED IN THE WILL

Mr. Speaker, the trustees named in the will apparently have faithfully discharged their duties under the terms of the will. The deceased testator, Robert Marshall, to all intents and purposes, intended that they distribute his large estate to Communist and subversive enterprises because he, himself, was at heart if not in fact, a Communist, and by his will he created a huge million-dollar Communist-front bank or fund for almost the sole benefit of the Communist Party. He was associated with and active in Communist fronts himself during his lifetime. Robert Marshall knew the character of the men he named as trustees under his will. He was associated with them during his lifetime. They were his intimate and personal friends. He had confidence in them. Indeed, two of them were his own brothers, James and George Marshall. James Marshall was the executor and attorney for the estate and George Marshall was alternate executor and trustee.

George Marshall was the chairman of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, a Communist front, and became chairman of its successor, the Civil Rights Congress. This House voted him in contempt and he was subsequently indicted, tried, convicted, and sentenced to 3 months in jail and fined \$500 for his refusal to answer questions and obey a subpoena for production of records of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

George Marshall has a record of affiliation by membership in, or otherwise with, over 30 Communist-front organizations and movements.

The very first trustee named in the will, Gardner Jackson, of Chevy Chase, Md., who was named and served as trustee of both the Robert Marshall Foundation and the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust, is an old-time Red. He was twice employed in the Department of Agriculture and removed from office each time. The first time he was removed on February 8, 1935, by Chester Davis; was later reappointed on June 30, 1941, and again fired on March 1, 1943, by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard.

Gardner Jackson has been associated with, as a sponsor, speaker, endorser, and member of 22 Communist and subversive organizations. In addition he has a local police record showing 10 years associated with and attendance at practically every Communist Party-sponsored meeting in the District of Columbia or nearby Maryland. Gardner Jackson himself is a very wealthy man.

It was Gardner Jackson who supplied the \$105 paid to David Dubois Mayne for forged letters smearing Martin Dies. Frank Hook, of Michigan, placed these letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and subsequently had them deleted when Mayne entered a plea of guilty to an indictment in the District of Columbia to forgery, uttering, and obtaining money under false pretenses.

Jerry O'Connell, another trustee of this estate and a former Member of this House, has a record of affiliation, connections and even employment by Communist-front and subversive organizations which is astounding. He has been affiliated in one way or another with 20 fronts. Recently the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a pamphlet regarding his connections with the National Committee to defeat the Mundt bill, now the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the law of the land. His brazen efforts along this line are indeed amazing.

Jerry O'Connell was actually registered with the Clerk of the House as a lobbyist for this very purpose, as pointed out by the Committee on Un-American Activities in their report. Jerry O'Connell worked with the National Lawyers Guild, the legal arm of the Communist Party, in a joint endeavor to prevent the internal security bill from becoming law.

Still another trustee, Roger Baldwin, for years the executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, is an old-time apologist for communism for over 30 years. He has been affiliated with over 40 Communist-front organizations and served time in jail for obstructing the draft in the First World War.

Edwin S. Smith, the former member of the National Labor Relations Board, also a trustee, has a record of affiliation with more than 16 Communist fronts.

FEES FOR REMINGTON'S LAWYER

Mr. Speaker, an examination of the disbursements of the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust shows that a Washington, D. C., attorney, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of 1631 K Street NW., who is chairman of the executive committee of Americans for Democratic Action, has also received several thousand dollars from the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust.

Mr. Speaker, this Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., is the attorney of record for William Walter Remington, late of the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce. It will be recalled that Remington's conviction for perjury was recently reversed by the Circuit Court of Appeals on technical grounds, and the case remanded for a new trial.

Francis Biddle, who is now national chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, is the same Francis Biddle who, as Attorney General of the United

States in 1942, declared many of the organizations to be Communist fronts or subversive which have been, and still are, receiving thousands of dollars in grants from the Robert Marshall Foundation.

The records of the New York Trust Co., furnished to the Committee on Un-American Activities, show that on July 14, 1950, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., attorney, received \$10,000 from the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust; and again on November 20, 1950, the same Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., attorney, received an additional \$10,000, or a total of \$20,000 out of this estate.

Mr. Speaker, Martin Dies had an examination made of the income-tax returns of this estate in 1942, and the examination showed that the attorneys for the estate, Marshall, Bratter & Seligson, of 150 Broadway, New York City, claimed that there was no tax to be paid on the income of the estate because "entire principal of the estate is distributable for educational purposes pursuant to the will of the deceased."

I desire to invite the attention of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the House Committee on Ways and Means to this \$20,000 disbursement from this estate. I am sure that the executors will have difficulty in convincing either the Commissioner or the committee that attorney's fees for the defense of William Walter Remington—who was charged and convicted of lying about being a Communist Party member, in addition to being a spy for the Soviet Union—constitutes a grant for educational purposes which would entitle the estate to exemptions from taxation under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, as amended.

THOMAS CHARLES BLAISDELL, JR.

Mr. Speaker, the last will and testament of Robert Marshall, a photostat of which I hold in my hand, is witnessed as previously stated by Catherine Maltby Blaisdell and Thomas C. Blaisdell, whose signatures appear thereon and who certified that the will of Robert Marshall was signed, sealed, published, and declared in their presence and hearing, and in the presence and hearing of each of them, who thereunto subscribed their names as witnesses. The signatures appear not only at the end of the will but on page 4 where the testator made a change in the name of a trustee.

Mr. Speaker, Catherine Maltby Blaisdell is shown to be the wife of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., in the hearings conducted on the nomination of Mr. Blaisdell to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on March 22, 1949. Thomas C. Blaisdell also signed the will of Robert Marshall as a witness, but it is not known whether this is Thomas C. Blaisdell, Sr., who died December 11, 1948, at Sanford, Seminole County, Fla., or Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., the former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who resigned January 15, 1951, to take a position as professor at the University of California, but who later and until recently was in Paris representing the Foreign Economic Administration, ac-

cording to information obtained from the State Department.

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., when testifying before the subcommittee of the Senate investigating the Remington case in July and August of 1948, admitted that he was responsible for the employment of William W. Remington in his \$10,000 position with the Department of Commerce. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., was then Director of the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce.

Remington was subsequently suspended but later cleared by the Seth W. Richardson Loyalty Board and reinstated in his position at the Department of Commerce with full back pay.

In 1950 the un-American Activities Committee reopened the case with hearings beginning on April 20, 1950, and continuing through July 30, 1950, as a result of which Remington was called before a New York grand jury investigating espionage and subsequently indicted for perjury. But 1 year prior to this, Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., was nominated for the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce and hearings were held on his nomination on February 23 and March 22, 1949. He was extensively questioned on the Remington case at the second hearing on March 22, 1949, at which time Joe Rauh also appeared as a witness and testified that Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr. had executed an affidavit of character for William W. Remington to be presented to the President's Loyalty Review Board, of which Seth W. Richardson was chairman.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that further investigation should be made:

First. Into the Robert Marshall Foundation, particularly in regard to the connections of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., and his wife, Catherine Maltby Blaisdell, with the deceased Robert Marshall and the trustees of his estate, and the manner in which the estate has been administered.

Second. Into whether any tax-exempt privileges have been granted to this estate by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, particularly in view of the payment of \$20,000 of the funds of the foundation to Joe Rauh, attorney for Remington.

Third. Into the Communist-propaganda activities of the organizations which received almost \$1,000,000 out of this Communist-front estate.

Fourth. Into the connections and activities of certain persons, whose names I have not disclosed but whose names appeared in connection with this matter, and about which further information and facts should be obtained.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that there is pending on the calendar, House Resolution 364, introduced by my good friend and colleague from Georgia GENE COX, to investigate generally the use of moneys by these tax-exempt foundations to finance subversive propaganda and activities, and I trust that this resolution will be adopted by the House. It certainly merits the support of every Member of this body.

EXHIBIT A

THE NEW YORK TRUST CO.
100 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

No. 159. JULY 10, 1950.
Pay to the order of Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.,
Attorney ----- \$10,000
Ten thousand ----- Dollars

ROBERT MARSHALL CIVIL
LIBERTIES TRUST,
JOHN F. FINNERTY, *Trustee*.
JAMES MARSHALL, *Trustee*.

ENDORSEMENTS REVERSE SIDE

Pay to Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
Attorney.
JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.

Pay Bankers Trust Co. or order. Winthrop,
Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

EXHIBIT B

THE NEW YORK TRUST CO.
100 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

No. 165. NOVEMBER 8, 1950.
Pay to the order of Joseph L. Rauh,
Attorney ----- \$10,000
Ten thousand ----- Dollars

ROBERT MARSHALL CIVIL
LIBERTIES TRUST,
JOHN F. FINNERTY, *Trustee*.
JAMES MARSHALL, *Trustee*.

ENDORSEMENTS REVERSE SIDE

Pay to Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
Attorney.

Pay Bankers Trust Co. or order. Winthrop,
Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

EXHIBIT C

MEMORANDUM

William C. Chanler, chief counsel for William Walter Remington, is a member of the law firm of Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, of 40 Wall Street and 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (p. 2150 Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory, vol. II, 1951).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE HONORABLE HALE BOGGS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a statement with reference to our colleague the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. HALE BOGGS. I am sure all of the Members of the House who have read the press dispatches were shocked at the amazing announcement that an effort is being made by his political opposition to secure the removal of his name from the ballot as a candidate for Governor on the ground that he is of Communist sympathies, that the gentleman from Louisiana has joined Communist-front organizations, that he has maintained membership in subversive organizations and that he is promoting a radical and subversive movement in the United States.

I do not know what the laws of Louisiana provide, but I assume, of course, that if such allegations—I am speaking abstractly—could be proved, any candidate would be in danger of having his name removed from the ballot in the Democratic primary. But I am sure, too, Mr. Speaker, that no Member of this House would entertain for a moment the faintest suspicion that the gentleman

has any sympathies whatever for radical organizations or would tolerate them.

As a matter of fact, his entire record, both in and out of this House, is strikingly to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to others who have indicated a desire to endorse my statement I would like to say that it is the purpose of none of us to interfere in the elections of Louisiana.

Certainly, as a neighbor to the good people of Louisiana I would not undertake to advise them in political decisions of this kind, and I am sure they would not tolerate any such effort if I should go so far afield as to interfere. My concern is the potential damage that might be done by such ridiculous and absurd and unfounded charges to an honorable citizen and then to our election system.

My purpose today is not to promote Mr. Boggs' candidacy, but to do what I can to help a good American keep the record straight and to assist our friend as an American and to prevent a great injustice.

I remember when I first became acquainted with the gentleman from Louisiana. We were all impressed by his outstanding ability when he came to this House. He had been here for a short period before I became a Member and then went away for a while, and when he returned, after rendering a distinguished service in the Navy, when he returned to this House he impressed everyone of us who had arrived in the interim period by his outstanding ability and certainly by his loyalty and his correct Americanism. So naturally, I am anxious today, as his colleague in the House, to say what I can in defense of him as an American.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this with reference to the matter that the gentleman from Arkansas has brought to the attention of the House. I feel that I have had even a better opportunity to know the loyalties of this great man, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, better perhaps than some others, because it was my good fortune to reside within his home for approximately 3 months during last fall. During that time we frequently discussed political philosophy; we discussed international problems, and it was on one evening, I recall, that he told me that he had devised a definition of this proposition of communism and that he had defined it as three things: First, it is an economic theory based on a perverted philosophy of life; secondly, it is a political move; third, it is an international conspiracy to control the world. He spoke most violently of this philosophy of communism, and certainly no Member among us feels more keenly about the danger of communism than our friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS. Surely no one residing in Louisiana, who knows the gentleman from Louisiana [HALE BOGGS], will believe any part of this absurd charge, and to those who do not know it, I would like to add my voice of assurance that the charges are utterly groundless.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas yielding me time to say a word or two in behalf of my very dear friend and my able colleague the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS. We were sworn in as Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress on the same day, and from that day to this hour there has always been a very close bond of friendship and understanding between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and myself. On many occasions we have worked along with a rather small group representing both political parties in this House, including the gentleman from Arkansas and others who have spoken; worked in a nonpartisan way in an effort to bring about some real approach to the question of peace and international understanding. I have been in many, many conferences with the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, off the floor of the House, and I know of no other person in all of my acquaintance whom I consider to be a greater American than the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS. Like the gentleman from Arkansas, it is not my purpose or my intention to attempt to inject myself into a political primary in the State of Louisiana, but when I read the accusation of communism made against the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, yesterday, the thought occurred to me that if the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, is guilty of those charges, then where can we go to find a true American? I know him to be that type of American. I appreciate the opportunity of saying a few words to let the people of Louisiana know how I feel about it, regardless of any political implications it might have in that State.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he does not recall the very distinguished service the gentleman from Louisiana gave us, for example, in connection with the training of the merchant-marine seamen, his determination to get sufficient funds for strengthening the armed defense of the Nation in that respect, and his service in expanding the antinarcotics program for the defense of our youth? Would these be the acts of a man who is interested in destroying our institutions?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Louisiana has taken the well of this House many times to speak in behalf of the programs the gentleman has mentioned. He served in the Navy with distinction and honor during World War II. He came back to the House of Representatives fired with enthusiasm and a determination to build the defenses of this Nation, its moral defenses, its spiritual defenses, its military and its economic defenses. I know of no person who has labored more diligently and, I might say, more effectively in accomplishing those objectives.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of the people of Louisiana being misled by any such dastardly charge as that which has been made against HALE Boggs, one of the most loyal and one of the most able and capable men in this House. I do not know of a man I have known since I have been a Member of the Congress for whom I have more admiration than I do for HALE Boggs. I feel sure that the charge will react in his favor and that it will be a boomerang against the person who started it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], a former State commander of the American Legion and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, on which the gentleman from Louisiana serves.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, these most absurd charges certainly will not have any weight in the great State of Louisiana. They have not sent a more effective or a more able Representative to this Congress in the last 14 years, at least since I have been here. We on the Committee on Ways and Means consider Mr. Boggs one of the strongest members of that committee. His work is effective. He is responsible. There is no more clear-headed thinker or sounder American than HALE Boggs. Of course, these charges are absolutely unfounded and absurd.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I regard HALE Boggs not only as a friend but as an outstanding, able, conscientious, honest and fair-minded Member of the House of Representatives. HALE Boggs is a member of the Roman Catholic Church. He is not only a Catholic but he is a good Catholic, which means that he is a good Christian. A good Christian believes in God and, by the fact that he believes in God, he believes in the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, and the teachings of the sermon on the mount. That is something that they do not believe in Moscow or in the Kremlin because it is a known fact that a real Communist does not even believe in God. I know because I asked several Communists that question when I was in Moscow during World War II. When they gave me their answer, I remember how sick it made me at my stomach. Yes, because the rumors that I had previously heard were the cold bare facts. Out of their own mouths they had proclaimed it.

I know that, good Catholic that HALE Boggs is, he practices his religion daily. We Members here who are associated with and who know him best have seen and observed him in his excellent daily treatment of his fellow men, which is in a sense practicing his religion by doing unto others as he would have them do unto him. To say, my friends, that HALE

Boggs is a Communist or a pro-Communist is like saying the American flag here over the Speaker's Chair represents the hammer and sickle. It is like saying that Boston has no beans. It is like saying that Kentucky has no thoroughbreds. It is like saying Louisiana has no politics. I might say this for the RECORD, the gentleman speaking is a Protestant and a Mason. I am not interested in the politics of Louisiana. I do not care who wins the election, but by the grace of God I do want to see a decent man, treated decently. I might add that the sole purpose of this utterance is to help prevent what appears to me to be a well-planned smear campaign against a real Southern gentleman, a proud Louisianian, an able legislator, and a great American, the Honorable HALE Boggs.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to Mr. Boggs' friend and colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have heard of the charges which came from Louisiana, which have been made against our colleague, HALE Boggs, improvidently in the course of the race for governor. I say "unfortunately" made because I think it was a serious mistake to even consider the matter of entertaining of charges of this character against HALE Boggs.

I know of HALE's record in the House of Representatives. I recall when he introduced a bill here called the anti-picketing bill. I discussed with him the reason and motive for introducing that bill. His reason was he felt that the Communists should not be allowed to picket our Federal courts. He presented the bill to the Congress, and it passed, and became the law of the land. HALE Boggs wants to uphold our Federal courts against the abuses of those who are Communists and are of Red leanings. I remember his fight in support of measures which would rid our Government of those who had communistic records, and to take them out of their jobs if they were not all 100-percent Americans.

I checked his record, and I know of his record in reference to national defense. He has supported every national defense measure, which came before the Congress before and since Pearl Harbor. The fact that he was in the Navy during World War II has naturally clung to him tenaciously in his career in the Congress. He supported the Armed Forces of the United States while he had been a Member here. I can recall in the course of the debate on the extension of the selective service, which occurred this spring in the House of Representatives. The debate extended over a 2 weeks' period of time, and it was one of the most acrimonious debates we have had in the House of Representatives this year. During a high point in the course of that debate, HALE Boggs took the floor of this House and delivered a masterful speech, urging active support of that vital measure. It was one of the greatest speeches I have heard. I think his speech had a great deal to do with resolving serious doubts in the minds of a

great many of our Members regarding their support for this bill and helped to put over that measure which was vitally important this year to our national defense. I say again, I am amazed that charges of this sort are made against our colleague, HALE Boggs. Such speeches do not come from an alien head or a disloyal mind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, are there any other special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that there are two other special orders.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if it is not an imposition, with the permission of those who have special orders, may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, am glad to yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will not consume all of the time. I do thank those who have special orders, and I thank the House for hearing me and my colleagues at this inconvenient hour.

I just recalled one mark of distinction that I think might go into the RECORD while we are speaking of the unfairness of this charge, and the fact that a worthy person might be made the victim of unscrupulous political strategy; that is, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] has often been called upon to preside over sessions of the Committee of the Whole House. I think it would be a fair appraisal to say that no one has presided with any greater dignity or ability. He is perhaps one of the most popular presiding officers in the House. But the fact that he has been called upon by the Speaker to preside is evidence of the esteem that the Speaker of the House holds for him.

Further, Mr. Speaker, this House is a testing ground. He has been a Member of the House, with one brief interruption, since 1940. I am sure that evidences the fact that the sound-thinking people of New Orleans and Louisiana recognize in him those elements of loyalty and leadership that are so essential to the survival of our democratic way of life.

Not only are individuals being tested, but systems are being tested. May I advert again to the necessity of proving the soundness of our free system of elections? The fact that amazement and disgust has been expressed over the unfairness of this attack is evidence that a strong conviction is entertained on that score, that we believe elections should be conducted in a way that does not throttle one candidate or take unfair advantage of him; that all candidates should have an opportunity to

present their points of view and their philosophies to the people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that I have brought up this unpleasant incident, in order that we might give expression to the faith we have in the essential loyalty and in the Americanism of a colleague who aspires to another office.

I would point out, too, since a question is raised as to the propriety of his seeking another office while holding membership in the House, that we have rejoiced to see our colleagues in the past entertain and realize the same ambition. Millard Caldwell, a Member of the House, was elected to the governorship of the State of Florida. Earl Clement, while a Member of the House, was made Governor of the great State of Kentucky. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, became Governor of that State while serving here. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut, and many others, have entertained the same ambitions and have been honored by their people.

Mr. Speaker, I make the forecast that the people of Louisiana will see the absurdity of these charges and that they will repudiate them and that our colleague will be given an opportunity to conduct his campaign without this kind of unfair dealing.

There are many other Members of the House who would have spoken had they had notice that this subject would be presented. One of my colleagues from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who has served with Mr. Boggs on the Ways and Means Committee, learned of it, but because of other duties could not be here. He was extremely anxious that I quote him to the same effect.

It was my privilege to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and I came to know him intimately. Soon after he became a member of the Ways and Means Committee I transferred to the Foreign Affairs Committee. I know something of his views on foreign affairs also. I know that he is sound, that his chief interest is to protect the United States, that he is deeply concerned about our security. He and I have not seen eye to eye on all details of foreign policy matters, but I am sure of this, that every judgment he has formed has been independently formed, and he has arrived at what I believe is sound position as to basic foreign policy questions of the day.

I again apologize, Mr. Speaker, for taking this much time, but I know the Members would agree that far more than one political career is involved. It is not the ambition of an individual but the principle for which we are fighting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the Record on the subject just discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the charges that our colleague, HALE BOGGS,

is a Communist, or has Communist sympathies, are so irresponsible as to immediately indict the veracity of anyone who makes such a statement.

HALE BOGGS is not only a loyal American but one of the most outstanding Members of Congress. He has the mental ability to quickly grasp a problem and the judgment and experience to offer a dependable solution.

I would regret the loss to the House of Representatives by the departure of HALE BOGGS, but if the people of Louisiana call him to the higher office as the governor of that great State, he carries my best wishes and the conviction that he can provide outstanding leadership—loyal, courageous, and energetic—to which this beautiful State is rightfully entitled.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of those who have other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the program for tomorrow and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Private Calendar will be called tomorrow as announced.

There are two matters out of the Rules Committee: A House joint resolution relating to the celebration in connection with the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of West Point; and Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, which relates to the appointment of 14 Members to attend and participate in the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

I know of no other legislation for the rest of the week that will come up under the regular rules of the House.

Mr. KEATING. I assume that conference reports will be in order if they come in.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was coming to that. Conference reports, of course, will be in order at any time. It is hoped, and I put all Members on both sides on notice, that another conference report on the tax bill will come in on Friday. I cannot give any definite assurances, but I want to put Members on notice to expect it. I believe they ought to be here, and they can govern themselves by the notice that I give as to what might be the reasonable expectation. We are notifying our Members to be here on Friday, to expect it to come up. I make this statement so that all Members of the House will be advised as to the probability of its coming up again.

Postal pay increase: I understand the conferees have agreed on the postal pay increase bill. When the report will be written and filed I am unable to state, but that is only a matter of time.

I will keep the membership advised as far in advance as I possibly can; but, as they may know, some conference reports may be called up as soon as filed with the usual understanding of the leadership on both sides.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When will the resolution for adjournment be brought up?

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution for what?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. For adjournment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could answer that question; I can only answer it on hope.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are certain matters I am very anxious to have transpire, and I should hate to adjourn Saturday if they had not transpired.

Mr. McCORMACK. I only wish I could answer the gentlewoman's question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But the resolution is not likely to come in until just before we do adjourn.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer the question; I wish I could.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for good intentions.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] has a special order following mine and that of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, but because he has a tight train connection to make I ask unanimous consent on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] may proceed ahead of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] is recognized.

LET'S ABOLISH THE INDIAN BUREAU NOW

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I wrote a series of articles for the Reader's Digest on the status of the American Indians and the need for their full independence and citizenship. One of those articles was entitled "Set the American Indians Free."

When I took up the task of campaigning for a seat in Congress last year, I made clear my position on this question. I said that I would stand for and work for complete freedom and citizenship for all American Indians.

When I say "freedom" for the American Indians, I mean just that. I mean freedom from the all-encompassing Indian Bureau which at present and for many years back has enthralled him. While a Member of this Congress, I hope to make good on my pledge to help solve this problem in the only proper way.

On March 6 of this year I introduced H. R. 3073, a bill to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to re-

move the guardianship over Indians and the trusteeship over Indian property and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984) as amended—the so-called Wheeler Howard Act. An identical bill has been subsequently introduced in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who has previously sponsored a similar bill in the Eighty-first Congress.

None of us can pretend to be all-wise and all-knowing on all the twists and turns of the Indian problem. The legal position of the Indian today has been made extremely complicated due to the activities of the Indian Bureau through the many years of its existence. This complication is used as an excuse to retain the services of the Bureau since it alone is presumed to be familiar with the ins and outs of the matter. There are many ancient treaties, mostly obsolete now, many special legislative enactments, innumerable executive and departmental orders and whatnot pertaining to the several hundred tribes and bands. As the years have passed more and more of these legislative enactments of a special nature have been passed so that it is hardly possible to obey one law without contravening another. But the present bill does not propose any further muddying of the waters with additional special legislation. Quite the reverse. It makes for complete elimination of all these complexities and constitutes a very real and lasting solution.

The counsel of expediency has hitherto prevailed in regard to Indian legislation. The policy has often been to patch up things here and there and to temporize while the situation has steadily deteriorated. But this is not a matter to be dealt with by half measures. In an affair involving human freedom you have got to act finally and decisively if ultimate disaster is to be prevented. As was said on another occasion of this sort, no nation can survive half slave and half free. In other words we have a mess to clean up here and we have to do the job whether we like it or not.

Much, if not most, of the confusion and cross purposes which at present prevail in Indian Affairs has come about since 1934 when the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act was passed. In that year Mr. John Collier and his fellow conspirators succeeded in getting authority for reorganizing Indian tribes and thus binding them up in neat little bundles for more convenient handling by the Indian Bureau. The basic error involved in this legislation was the attempt to turn the clock back for Indians by a century and to make primitive tribesmen out of a people who were well advanced in most instances along the road to civilization and full citizenship. And so, by starting the horse off in the wrong direction, so to speak, Mr. Collier and men of his ilk have infinitely delayed the full assimilation of the Indians into citizenship. Indeed they have completely confused the picture of Indian progress by promoting reversion to primitive and uncivilized ways of living. And now we are witnessing today the fruits of this grave injustice to our Indian fellow Americans in the demoralization of domestic life amongst them and the perversion of

the basic American concepts of private property and law and order by the Indian Bureau administration on reservations. This whole movement has been the work of a few men who got control of the Indian Bureau in 1933 and 1934 and worked their will without effective opposition there. I shall have occasion to revert to Mr. Collier's role in this nefarious plot a little later in this discussion.

The logic of the present situation inevitably calls for the abolition of the Indian Bureau. As it stands today, it constitutes the only real obstacle to full citizenship of the Indians. It is the Indian Bureau alone which has constantly and so far effectively blocked every attempt to make Indians citizens like other Americans. It has done so, however, while rendering lip service to the principle of Indian freedom and citizenship and to the idea of complete liquidation of its own activities in the public interest. When, however, the Indian Bureau really feels that its survival is at stake, it fights hard against any diminution of its powers or activities. Time and experience have proved that you cannot do business with the Indian Bureau if it feels its survival is a stake. In fact the Indian Bureau will defend its present power to regulate Indian lives and property to the last Indian. Every step of the road to liquidation is a constant fight.

It is my belief that in this issue the time has come for each and every one of us to stand up and be counted. The issue can be very simply stated: "Do you favor the interest of the Indians, or the interest of the Indian Bureau?" This is a question which I would like to put to all my friends and colleagues in this august body. Our responsibility is to recognize and to differentiate between the interest of the Indians and the interest of the Indian Bureau. The interest of the Indian, on the one hand involves freedom to administer his own property and land and to participate in local civic life along with his fellow Americans; the interest of the Indian Bureau on the other hand is in perpetuating itself and its paternalistic control over Indian lives and property for all time to come.

The Indians are people just like you and me, people who want to be as free as anyone else to carry on their own private business, to administer their own properties and to live their own lives under laws which are passed by them for their own governance along with other fellow citizens. The Indian Bureau, on the other hand, is an antique form of a Government agency interested solely in conserving and increasing its power and prestige and in maintaining itself at any cost regardless of justice or decency.

From 1934 on, the Indian Bureau has conceived its interest to be in the maintenance of the Indians as a special class apart from the rest of the citizens. In this way it can continue to grow and extend itself parasitically over the lives and property of these, our fellow Americans. For, if you take away the power of the Indian Bureau over Indian property and lives the bureaucracy will wither away at once without further reason for existence. Thus it can be seen that the

obvious purposes of the Indian Bureau work at complete cross purposes to the cause of Indian assimilation and citizenship.

It is evident, moreover, that the Indian will never learn to manage his own affairs and property as long as a Government bureau does these things for him. The Indian is not permitted to operate his own business, for example, because the Indian Bureau-sponsored puppet tribal councils control and regulate all business enterprise on reservations. The Indian businessman must do as he is told by his Bureau mentors.

Our foreign-born citizens from many lands learned freedom by first-hand participation in the responsibilities of making their own decisions in matters affecting their persons and properties. Many have gone to night school and attended classes in citizenship to prepare themselves for American life and for full participation in the rights and duties of citizenship. By the time they were sufficiently acclimated to the ways of freedom they took out papers of citizenship and were received into the comradeship of their fellow Americans. They did not have the vast array of benefits and services of an Indian Bureau to administer their affairs for them. If they had had such parasitic agency to tell them what to do they would never have become citizens in the full sense of the word any more than the Indians have. No, the foreign born learned by experience and by hard-won education just what was involved in citizenship. Not having a bureaucracy to impede their progress they generally emerged during individual lifetimes from their apprenticeship into the status of full citizens of the same standing as any other American.

But can we see any possibility of an American Indian learning to become a full citizen in this way during his lifetime? Have we indeed any reason to even expect him to want to become a full citizen in this way if Indian Bureau tutelage continues on a permanent basis? Of course not. It would seem as though the Indian Bureau is the carrier of a fatal disease, a disease which has wrecked more than one people in history, the disease of totalitarianism and state paternalism, having some authority, preferably the government, tell one what to do and managing all one's affairs. With such a guardian always at his elbow how can the Indian ever learn to do anything for himself?

But then what about the so-called tribal councils which have been set up for Indians under the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act? Do they provide each tribe of Indians with a machinery of self-government in which the average Indian can learn the principles of freedom and democracy? Are Indians learning to think for themselves through these devices and to defend their own interests? The answer to each one of the foregoing questions is a most decided negative. The Indian Bureau's puppet tribal councils constitute the exact opposite to the true American principles of freedom and self-government. The Indian young people of today will tell you, if you ask them, that they do not learn the ways

of freedom and citizenship from the puppet tribal organizations of the Indian Bureau. On the contrary they learn the ways of totalitarianism and collectivism and above all the elements of chicanery and underhanded manipulation of other people's property and lives by a bureaucratic machine.

Recently, we have become aware of the importance of having honest men in our Government. We are, in fact, becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that you cannot have self-government function unless there is a minimum of decency and honesty among the administrators of that government. In a governmental agency so dominated as the Indian Bureau has been, there are no lessons of self government or freedom for the Indian youth.

We have come to regard freedom of enterprise and individual initiative as fundamental to our way of life. But under the Indian Bureau's puppet tribal governments there is no freedom of enterprise or individual initiative. Instead there are only tribal enterprises and enterprises supported by loans from puppet tribal councils. The latter are in turn dependent upon the Indian Bureau for support and loans. The Indian Bureau, through its control of the \$10,000,000-revolving-loan fund and of many tribal trust funds and other sources of capital, maintains absolute and effective control over all its puppet tribal councils. So this can be used to explain why it is impossible for an Indian veteran to get a loan from non-Indian Bureau sources even though he may be entitled to it under the GI bill of rights. Freedom of enterprise and individual initiative are completely discouraged by the Indian Bureau and its puppet tribal councils.

But the Indian Bureau has not been able to contain itself within the modest bounds set up under that act. It has insisted on going beyond the bounds of the law and set up institutions which were proposed in the original version of the bill but not contained in the act as passed. I refer to the tribal courts, really kangaroo courts, which administer a special kind of law for many tribes under the so-called tribal codes of law and order. In this way the tribalized Indians are placed under a special kind of law separate from the State and county law and made more amenable to Indian Bureau control. These kangaroo courts have absolutely no validity or authority under any law of any State or under Federal law. Their operation is, in fact, quite in opposition to State laws and contrary to any law passed by Congress. Since the organization of these kangaroo courts, domestic morality among Indians has declined immensely. The regulation of marriage and divorce among Indians by these courts has been scandalous and contrary to public policy. It is a matter of record that the passage of the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act signaled the beginning of a general decline in obedience by Indians to State laws of marriage and divorce. When such is the case, what sort of education in freedom under law and in United States citizenship do you suppose the Indian youth on reservations is getting?

It is self-evident that the only way Indians can learn American ways is by participating in the same institutions of local government as other citizens, in the State and county courts, by exercise of the franchise in local and State elections, and by being elected to political office. The Indians can never learn the ways of American citizenship from tribal codes imposed through Indian Bureau tribal courts separated from other citizens. In no case has the slightest voluntary effort been made by the Indian Bureau to transfer the Indians under its control to the States for the administration of law and order. Instead, the Indians have been encouraged and abetted in the development of separate institutions of Government and for maintaining law and order which serve to keep them as a class apart from other citizens.

Now, allow me to digress from the main line of my discussion to mention the roles which certain individuals have played in the development of the recent Indian Bureau policies which are so contrary to the interests of justice and freedom.

There is first Mr. John Collier, a former Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to whom I have already referred. He is, or was at least, the chief factotum of the crowd of visionaries and socialistic conspirators who first attached their tentacles to the long suffering Indians in 1933. Mr. Collier and his cohorts pushed through the Wheeler-Howard Act, not in the original form which they would have liked to see enacted—that was too extreme even for those wild days of the New Deal—but with all the provisions for puppet tribal councils, revolving loan fund and possibilities for new reservations which have served as devices for keeping the Indians apart from other citizens. Mr. Collier's regime was marked by flat failure in solving any aspect of the Indian problem and that he was finally dismissed in 1945 after his failure to regiment some of the larger tribes such as the Navajo had caused rebellion and discontent in the ranks of his entourage.

This same Mr. Collier, who almost always writes in a vein of seemingly earnest solicitation for the Indians' welfare, never quite secured the full confidence of Congress in his schemes for socialistic regimentation of the Indians. In fact those who knew him most closely were of the opinion that he was a mere adventurer who was possessed of a wild dream of becoming some sort of modern day Moses, destined to lead all of the Indians of the Western Hemisphere to some promised land. During his term of office he sent out his agents far and wide to dig up all the historically disbanded tribes they could find and to reorganize them under Bureau-constructed constitutions in complete subservience to him. And, as he gathered new tribes under his wings in this way his power waxed and his ego expanded correspondingly.

Since his dismissal from the post of Commissioner in 1945 he has attempted to maintain an influence over the subsequent policies of the Bureau in every way possible. He has organized an "Institute of Ethnic Affairs" as a pressure

group for his crowd and has also kept a finger in the Congress of American Indians which was originally organized under his auspices.

Mr. Collier was just one individual in a crowd of socialistic visionaries but he, more probably than any other single person, is responsible for the present awful mess of Indian affairs. During his tenure of office, although many tribes voted to reject the application of the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act, he went right ahead and organized them any way with the usual puppet tribal council and other institutions. In doing this he was, of course, disobeying the law but carrying out the schemes of Indian enslavement which had been apparent in the original bill from which the act was derived. So his whole scheme of reviving an almost extinct tribalism worked against the basic interest of the Indian in assimilation and citizenship. Seemingly for Mr. Collier the only good Indian was a blanket Indian seated in front of his pueblo or hogan, engaged in some prehistoric arts and crafts, or performing a snake dance beneath the light of the new moon by a flickering camp fire. And, of course, this would be a rather harmless and poetic hobby if confined to the lecture hall or backyard gossip, but when applied to the administrative realities of present-day life such an out-of-date idea had most disastrous results.

The reason I mention Mr. Collier in so much detail is because of the injustice which his administration worked on the Indian, an injustice which continues to the present time.

Since at least 1947 the Indian Bureau has been making public statements to the effect that it wants to start self liquidation immediately. Yet, to this date never a single voluntary step has been taken by that Bureau in the direction indicated. On the contrary a consistent practice of enlargement of operations, expenditures, and personnel has been pursued. Now this is certainly a serious situation. Evidently the Indian Bureau does not expect to be believed when it says one thing and does the opposite.

As time passes each day sees more and more of the private lives of our Indian fellow Americans being swallowed up by a totalitarian minded organization which, under the mask of performing public services, entralls the Indians to a still greater degree. The Bureau tells the Indians what kind of work he may do today. Tomorrow it will tell him where to eat and sleep and when to go to church. The very multitude of current activities of the Bureau for Indians makes one shiver to think of what the situation will be like on the morrow. The history of this Bureau is the history of an octopus, a monstrous growth greedy for power and reaching out without limit. It is, let me reemphasize once more, a situation which grows steadily worse with no prospect of relief or cessation.

The long life of the Indian Bureau, extending well over 120 years by now, leads one to reflect on the causes for the survival over so long a period of a particular agency of the Government. The

explanation to this is relatively easy. The fact of the matter is that the Indian Bureau is really a well-worked out system of political patronage. Through the fact that it holds out something for nothing to every Indian, the Bureau, like the famed Tammany political machine of New York City, gains continued support and maintains its insidious hold on its victims. The so-called services which the Indian Bureau ostensibly performs such as the maintenance of hospitals, schools, irrigation, forestry, soil conservation, road building, loans, range management, and so forth, are not, in the real sense of the phrase, public services, but are rather class benefits of a special nature which enable the Bureau to obligate the Indians and render more absolute their dependence on it. They constitute a front, so to speak, whereby the outsider is received by the seeming performance of important functions. These functions, needless to say, are performed by local government or other agencies for all other citizens. And, as time progresses, the extent of these activities increases and the debasement of the Indian becomes more disgraceful.

Nowadays it is becoming difficult, if not impossible, to discover an informed and intelligent public opinion among Indians in regard to their own interest divorced from that of the Indian Bureau. Most Indian tribes are, as a matter of fact, divided into factions on this very issue, the minority in most cases willing to act as pawns of the Bureau while the majority, possessed of more native intelligence, refuse to go along with bureau stooges and Bureau orders. It is upon these latter Indians that we must pin our hopes for achievement of Indian freedom and full citizenship. If a channel of public expression of the voices of the majority could be opened up, instead of the clamor which we at present get from a few Indian Bureau Indians, we would be able to mobilize a united protest capable of shaking loose the entire structure of the Indian Bureau. But at present the majority contents itself with passive resistance, apparently hoping that in due time the Indian Bureau will pass as other evils have. Let the majority of Indians be heard and the present system will fall of its own weight.

We cannot compromise in the matter of human freedom. We cannot release Indian tribes one by one or State by State or jurisdiction by jurisdiction. The Indians must be released as a whole and at once if the matter is to be accomplished thoroughly and satisfactorily. There is no other way. The small crowd which has hitherto run the Bureau will not be able to manipulate things their own way if a clean sweep is made of all Indian restrictions.

In conclusion I would like to say that I did not prepare this speech simply as another sounding board for personal opinions or to set up a political smoke-screen to cover lack of real accomplishment. I want to ask for a full consideration by Congress of the present bill with all angles weighed and considered and with the amount of committee or other hearings as are deemed needed. But I sincerely hope that we will not let this problem of freedom for our fellow

Americans to go by default without some worth-while action being taken on it. We can do something of the greatest importance by passing this bill and seeing that its provisions are carried out. The matter is urgent and the cause is just. Let us act now while our action will mean something and before it is too late.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from my duties in the House the rest of this week due to the death yesterday of my mother.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Upon previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when the great British historian, Mr. Toynbee, was asked to summarize the results of his lifelong study of the 21 major civilizations which have existed on this planet, it was not surprising, I think, that he had come by the study of man's experience to the same conclusion to which an increasing number of scientists is coming by the method of experimentation, and to which an increasing number of philosophers is coming by the methods of reflection and logic, and the same conclusions to which the seers and prophets of the ages came long ago by the methods of insight and inspiration, namely, that, above all else, man is a moral and spiritual being living in a moral and spiritual world under moral and spiritual laws that are just as real and dependable as are the laws of gravity, or the laws of electricity or the laws of nuclear fission. Man can violate these laws; he cannot break them. If he violates them, they break him. And so it is with a nation or a civilization.

Mr. Speaker, our forefathers established here the finest material civilization the world has ever seen, primarily, I think, because they put first the dignity and the sacredness and the decency of individual man as a spiritual being. It was because they put that first, not second, that the kind of society they developed was one which released as had never been done before in any time or place the creative capacities that are in ordinary people everywhere. Americans are no more capable than other peoples, but our society was such that it gave the individual in America who had imagination and the will to get ahead the opportunity to use his capacities to the utmost. He was not doomed, no matter what his ability, to remain frozen where he was born.

It was out of that spiritual concept that there developed a political philosophy based on the worth of the individual; and out of that political philosophy there developed an economic system where the individual had the right and the chance to get ahead, with his Government intervening only when necessary to prevent him from interfering with other people's right to get ahead

also. It was the sum total of individual efforts working together not in compulsion but in voluntary cooperation that produced this finest material civilization the world has ever seen.

Why did our forefathers put first the spiritual nature of men out of which the other good things have developed? It was because, in my judgment, most of them had been trained from their mothers' knees in the spiritual values and the ethical precepts of a religious faith that had been built up first by the Jews and later by the Christians during five or six thousand years and that are recorded and set forth in the Holy Bible. It is the source book of the eternal truths and principles behind the best in our culture.

It is to remind our people of these facts that for 10 years, a week in October has been set apart as National Bible Week, in which peoples of all walks of life—Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, rich and poor, city and country, labor and management, Democrats and Republicans, ministers and laymen, unite in calling everyone to study afresh the spiritual foundations of our society. Only as the rank and file of people in America go back to the wellspring from which came the ideas and the values which have made possible the good things we inherited, will we be able to preserve and transmit them to our children.

This year I have been happy to serve as chairman of National Bible Week. After months of preparation and organization, there has been an astonishing response—beyond my own faith, I confess. Almost every Governor in the United States has issued a proclamation—and some of them were truly inspired—calling upon the people of his State to read and study, each in his own way, through the religious organization of his own choice, or individually or in his home with his family, the great basic documents in the Bible—of history and law, of poetry and prophecy, of teaching and worship—which contain the ideas and ideals on which our country and the best things in our civilization were founded. Scores of mayors have issued proclamations or made statements over their local radio stations. A day or so ago I received a telegram from Philip Murray, head of the CIO, in which he urged "all the American people, regardless of creed, to give special consideration during this week to reading and studying the Holy Scriptures." Last week William Green, head of the A. F. of L., wrote that he would have an announcement made over that organization's Nation-wide hook-up, calling attention to Bible Week and urging all to observe it. A great many prominent business and industrial leaders have served as a committee of one hundred to support and promote the effort on a national scale.

It is gratifying and encouraging to find, when we are in trouble, as we are in trouble today, that more and more of our people are groping their way back from pursuit of false gods and trust only in our own strength or cleverness, to a recognition that "it is righteousness that exalts a nation" and nothing else, and that "except the Lord build the house, they

labor in vain who build it." It is reassuring in a time of such confused and disturbed conditions to find people in both high and low places recognizing that we are in difficulties beyond our human power to solve, and turning to God who all through history has proved adequate, if called upon by men in humility and penitence. The very things that are necessary to restore us to health are the things that are necessary for the rest of the world if it is to move forward to peace rather than backward to war and collapse.

Sometimes people here become so accustomed to the Judeo-Christian ethics which is our heritage and the integrity, decency, and humanitarianism which are the outgrowth of its religious concepts that they assume these are usual characteristics of natural man, that they are characteristics common to all human beings of whatever culture. It is not so. Such a notion is behind the false assumption, for instance, that since the men in the Kremlin are human beings, too, they will act as we do even though they are avowed atheists and deny the existence of moral law. But the best that we do or are is not because we are human; it is because we are trying to be Christian. Mere humans unconditioned by religious training or ethical values are predatory, like animals in the jungle. The reason we at our best are trying to liberate and build whereas Communist leaders seek to enslave and destroy is because we have been exposed for centuries to the Judeo-Christian ethics and teachings. The reason for the cold calculated cruelty of the leaders in the Kremlin is not because they are inhuman; rather it is because they are merely human and have denounced God and denied the existence of the moral principles that come from God.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress of the United States, too, need to have our attention called to Bible Week and its importance to us and our Nation. We have special weeks for everything under the sun. Surely there is nothing to which we can give study and attention with greater profit than the eternal truths upon which are based the best things that we want to strengthen and preserve in our civilization, in order to make it better here at home, and give it a better chance to spread abroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rogers] is recognized for 3 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will read a telegram that I sent today to General Gray:

Maj. Gen. CARL R. GRAY,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.:

Deeply shocked that service men and women at Walter Reed Hospital do not receive adequate information regarding their rights. Urge that Central Office send teams of rating, vocational training, rehabilitation, loans and insurance to go through hospital, spending enough time to give complete information. Men are lying in beds seriously wounded with no idea of their rights and privileges, mili-

tary and otherwise. It is cheating the veterans not to give them this information. Await immediate answer.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Veterans' Administration send enough men to tell the service men and women what they are going to receive when they get out of the hospitals so that they can plan their lives accordingly. During World War II we had to fight to get enough contact men and teams to go through the hospitals, but finally they did so. In World War II the tops, the heads of the rating schedule section, two or three doctors, and heads of other VA departments went through the hospitals in teams giving information relating to training and rehabilitation, loans and insurance, and all their benefits. The heads should go through the hospitals sometimes instead of sitting at their desks. And there should be enough VA men stationed at the hospitals all the time to advise our wounded heroes.

FAIR TRADE—SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS PROTECTION AGAINST CUTTHROAT PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission and other acts regulating trade practices. The purpose of this measure is to clarify the status of certain State laws, to affirm within specific limits the right of each State to determine its own policy with respect to the regulation of its internal affairs, and to enable each State to protect its domestic trade from unfair trade practices.

THE NEED FOR AMENDING THE MILLER-TYDINGS ACT

Specifically, the bill is designed to restore the Miller-Tydings Act to the status it occupied prior to the Court decision last May in *Schwegmann Bros. against Calvert Distillers Corp.* This decision deprived the Miller-Tydings Act of much of its effectiveness and struck a heavy blow at State fair-trade laws.

The Miller-Tydings Act was enacted in 1937 as an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission and Sherman Acts. Its purpose was to make it possible for the several States—if they so desired—to legislate on matters theretofore considered to be wholly within the orbit of Federal authority. Under this amendment the States could enact fair-trade laws affirming the right of a manufacturer of a proprietary article to exercise a measure of control over the price at which the product can be resold. It declared that the Federal Trade Commission and Sherman Acts did not render illegal a contract between a producer of a trade-marked article and his dealers prescribing minimum prices for the resale of the commodity when such contracts are lawful under State law. The act stipulated that the article must be in

free and open competition with commodities of the same general class, and also specifically forbade horizontal price-fixing agreements between manufacturers or between dealers.

A total of 42 States had enacted fair-trade legislation prior to the passage of the Miller-Tydings Act. Since then three additional States have acted. Nearly all of this legislation has been placed in jeopardy by the *Schwegmann* decision. If Congress intended to make it possible for States to exercise control over this matter as I believe it did and if Congress is still of the opinion that the States should have this right as I believe they should, then additional legislation is necessary.

THE SCHWEGMANN CASE

The issue confronting the courts in the *Schwegmann* case was whether the Miller-Tydings Act permits the States to enact laws which require dealers who are not parties to specific written contracts, the so-called nonsigners, to observe the prices stipulated by the manufacturer. In spite of the fact that every State law in existence at the time the Miller-Tydings Act was passed, as well as every law which has been enacted since, contains these nonsigner clauses, the Court said "No." The Miller-Tydings Act, according to the Court, grants only a limited immunity and does not authorize a State to permit a seller to enforce his prices on those who are not parties to specific contracts.

I am convinced that in 1937 Congress intended that the Miller-Tydings Act should exempt noncontractive price maintenance as well as contractive. Otherwise, the law made little sense. There would have been no reason to enact it. Doubtless the Court had good reasons for deciding otherwise. But that is not the point. The point is that now we must indicate to the Court in unmistakable language that Congress does intend to support existing State laws on this subject. The present bill does this.

PROVISIONS OF THIS AMENDMENT

The bill declares that it is the intention of Congress to reaffirm the inherent right of each State to regulate its internal affairs and specifically to enact legislation authorizing contracts prescribing minimum prices for the resale of commodities and to extend these prices to persons not parties to the contract. Section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act is to be amended by inserting a statement that the section does not apply to "contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale of a commodity which bears the trade-mark, brand, or name of the producer or distributor of such commodity and which is in free and open competition with the commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others," when such contracts "are lawful as applied to intrastate transactions." The bill further provides that all rights of action created by State laws may be exercised against nonsigners. The making of such contracts and their enforcement are not to be illegal under the Sherman Act. The bill specifically for-

bids agreements between manufacturers, or between wholesalers, or between retailers, or between "persons, firms or corporations in competition with each other."

PROTECTION AGAINST MONOPOLY

This bill is merely an enabling measure. It merely turns a specified and very limited area of trade regulation back to the States. It is not coercive. The States are not forced to do anything. All we are doing is to make it possible for States which believe in the principles of price maintenance to enact appropriate legislation. And I call your attention to the fact that the great bulk of the American people do believe in price maintenance. Otherwise we would not have these laws in 45 of our States.

If a State does not believe in price maintenance, it is not forced to tolerate the practice. In the absence of State legislation authorizing price maintenance, the Federal law remains unchanged. No State need fear any encroachment on its internal affairs by neighboring States pursuing a different policy.

The bill represents no change in our antitrust policy. It contains more than adequate protection against undesirable restraints of trade. The commodity whose price is under control must be "in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others." It will not be possible for a manufacturer to use price maintenance as an adjunct of monopoly because the law does not apply to any product which is not sold in a competitive market.

Nor need one fear that consumers will be charged higher prices under resale price maintenance. Stabilized prices do not mean high prices. The penalties for charging excessive prices are exactly the same as in any competitive economy, namely, loss of sales and reduced profits. Remember that monopoly involves horizontal control of the market. Resale price maintenance is vertical control.

NEED FOR FAIR TRADE LAWS

We believe the principles underlying fair trade legislation to be entirely sound for two basic reasons. First, price cutting is the favorite device of the mass distributor to force the independent out of business and to obtain a monopolistic position. Unfair pricing practices are a potent weapon in the hands of the monopolist and would-be monopolist. The preservation of our thousands of independent retailers is a basic necessity if the competitive system is to survive. The manufacturer who stabilizes his prices is merely placing the small retailer on an equal competitive footing with the massive chain store. Price maintenance is necessary to preserve competition at the retail level.

Secondly, the right to control resale prices is inherent in the very concept of a proprietary article. We believe that a manufacturer who develops a product, attaches his name to it, and spends huge sums in convincing the consuming public of its virtues should have a continuing interest in that product. He must

be able to protect his investment against the depredations of the price cutter who uses the good will of the real owner for his own personal gain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include a statement.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. SCHWABE, in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include miscellaneous material.

Mr. PHILLIPS (at the request of Mr. POULSON) and to include a statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE and to include a letter.

Mr. RAMSAY.

Mr. BOLLING to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. SCRIVNER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES and to include an editorial appearing in the Charlotte News of October 12 entitled "Prompt Action on Suez Problem."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRESTON and to include a speech delivered by Mr. W. G. Vollmer.

Mr. BUFFETT, in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; and

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity.

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 752. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S. 2233. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 2244. An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 1038. An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; and

H. R. 1764. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

Mr. VINSON, indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 18, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

890. A letter from the Acting Chairman Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its publication entitled "Typical Residential Electric Bills for Cities of 2,500 Population and More, January 1, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

891. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report showing the payment of claims for damage occasioned by naval vessels, which have been settled by the Navy Department, pursuant to section 8 of the act of July 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 726; 46 U. S. C. 797); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

892. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Postmaster

General to impound mail in certain cases"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1870. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the Bald Eagle", approved June 8, 1940; (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; with amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. Senate Concurrent Resolution 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4686. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4749. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 452. Resolution to provide for the payment of certain death and burial benefits to Thomas Logan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 437. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 436; with amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 468. Resolution relating to the making up of any deficit or shortage heretofore incurred in connection with the operation of the stationery room of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 5763. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling seven-eighths inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 5764. A bill to promote the cause of world peace by authorizing for a limited period the admission as temporary visitors to the United States of a number of nationals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and certain satellite countries to become acquainted with the American people and the American way of life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5765. A bill to promote the cause of world peace by authorizing for a limited period the admission as temporary visitors to the United States of a number of nationals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and certain satellite countries to become acquainted with the American people and the American way of life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 5766. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income under section 23 (p), any contribution made by an employer to a profit-sharing employees' trust within 90 days after the close of the taxable year with respect to which such contribution is made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 5767. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 5768. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5769. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5770. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5771. A bill to postpone any reapportionment of Representatives in Congress until after another census is taken, and to authorize a special quinquennial census in the year 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 5772. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5773. A bill to provide that no suit against a State may be commenced or maintained on behalf of the United States without the consent of such State, except with prior congressional authorization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5774. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 5775. A bill to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 5776. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to provide that Federal legislation which prohibits the employment of children during certain hours shall not apply with respect to the harvesting of basic agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 467. Resolution to provide for the establishment of a home for pages employed by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 5777. A bill for the relief of Hugo Kern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5778. A bill for the relief of Otmir Sprah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5779. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maleta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5780. A bill for the relief of Haruko Katie Kaneko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 5781. A bill for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5782. A bill for the relief of Lydia Sarrka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 5783. A bill for the relief of Robert Bertram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 5784. A bill for the relief of Heinrich (Henry) Schor, Sali Schor, and Gitta Aviva Schor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 5785. A bill for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 5786. A bill for the relief of Marigo Th. Tsipoura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 5787. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Edith Currie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

476. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Preakness Reformed Church, Preakness, N. J., deploring the absence of prayer in opening the sessions of the United Nations and urging that a room be provided in the new United Nations building as a place for meditation and prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

477. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of mothers of Virginia and members of the

Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, to protect our rights by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, as in former times Thy spirit didst breathe over the chaos, confusions, and divisions of struggling States and weld them into one Nation, and didst lead forth our fathers unto a wealthy place; so, we beseech Thee, in these latter days having girded us to conquer tyranny without, wilt Thou heal the tensions which threaten to tear the fair robe of our democracy. Save us from violence and discord, from all pride and arrogance. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those who in Thy name are here trusted with the authority of governance, to the end that there may be peace and prosperity within our borders. Forbid that the precious oil of our unity be spilled upon the ground to ignite selfish fires. May it still feed the flame of liberty's torch as it enlightens the whole darkened earth. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 17, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 16, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1718) for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) establishing a Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4467. An act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.; and

H. R. 5511. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3298. An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller;

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was granted leave from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week, after today.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF JOHN HOWARD PAYNE, AUTHOR OF HOME SWEET HOME

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that House Joint Resolution 284, which has just come over from the House of Representatives be laid before the Senate and acted upon at this time. Before the joint resolution is read, I might say that it concerns the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of the family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home.

The joint resolution calls for the appropriation of no money, but provides for a commission which is to act within a year. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader, I have conferred with the program committee of the minority, and with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and no one has any objection. The joint resolution should be passed promptly if the commission is to do any work. I have been asked to make this request, and I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I certainly shall not object, and I hope that the Senate will be able to sing

Home Sweet Home by Saturday night. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair joins the majority leader in that hope.

The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LETTERS, RESOLUTIONS, AND PETITIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mrs. John D. Peck, of Herndon, Va., transmitting a resolution and a petition of the mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, praying that their rights and those of their families might be protected by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERNDON, VA.,
October 15, 1951.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you please have this petition mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Thank you.

Yours truly,

LOUISE C. PECK
Mrs. John D. Peck.